arXiv:1401.3234v3 [math.DS] 27 Oct 2015

ASYMPTOTICS OF A CLASS OF WEIL-PETERSSON GEODESICS AND DIVERGENCE OF WP GEODESICS

BABAK MODAMI

Abstract. We show that the strong asymptotic class of Weil-Petersson (WP) geodesic rays with narrow end invariant [Mod15] and bounded annular coefficients is determined by the forward ending lamination. This generalizes the Recurrent Ending Lamination Theorem of Brock-Masur-Minsky proved in [BMM10]. As an application we provide a symbolic condition for divergence of WP geodesic rays in the moduli space.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Background 3
2.1. Curve complexes and hierarchy paths 4
2.2. Weil-Petersson metric 7
2.3. End invariants 8
3. Combinatorial control 10
3.1. Bounding annular coefficients 11
4. Variation of geodesics 14
4.1. Gauss-Bonnet formula 17
4.2. A length versus total curvature estimate 18
5. Contraction property of WP geodesic segments 20
6. Strongly asymptotic rays 37
References 45

1. Introduction

The Weil-Petersson (WP) metric is an incomplete Riemannian metric on the moduli space of Riemann surfaces with sectional curvatures asymptotic to 0 and $-\infty$ in the completion. These features prevent applying standard techniques like the shadow lemma to construct WP geodesic rays with specific behavior. Moreover, WP geodesic rays are not necessarily visible: Jeffrey Brock [Bro] constructs WP geodesics which travel closer and closer

Date: October 28, 2015.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 30F60, 32G15, Secondary 37D40.
The author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1005973.

to a chain of flats in the WP completion of the Teichmüller space which fail to be visible. The Weil-Petersson geodesic flow is not uniformly hyperbolic. Moreover Markov partitions are not available for coding of the WP geodesic flow.

Brock, Masur and Minsky, in analogy with the vertical geodesic lamination of a Teichmüller geodesic, introduced a notion of ending lamination for Weil-Petersson geodesic rays. It is conjectured that ending laminations, or a modification of them, can be used to parametrize the visual boundary of the WP metric, and the stable and unstable foliations of the WP metric. Furthermore, it is conjectured that end invariants and the associated subsurface coefficients provide a symbolic coding for Weil-Petersson geodesics in the moduli space.

In [BMM10], [BMM11] the authors explore several aspects of these conjectures. Significantly, they prove that the forward ending lamination determines the strong asymptotic class of recurrent WP geodesic rays to the thick part of the moduli space. Moreover, they show that the bounded combinatorics of end invariants is equivalent to co-boundedness of the geodesic (the geodesic projects to a compact subset of the moduli space). These results have dynamical consequences which among them are the topological transitivity of the Weil-Petersson geodesic flow on the moduli space and the fact that the topological entropy of the WP flow is unbounded.

In [Mod15] we considered WP geodesics with narrow end invariants, end invariants with a certain constraint on subsurfaces with a big subsurface coefficient (see Definition 2.2), and constructed examples of closed WP geodesics in the thin parts of the moduli space as well as divergent WP geodesic rays which travel closer and closer to a chain of completion strata in the WP completion of Teichmüller space, with minimal filling ending lamination.

In this paper we show that the strong asymptotic class of a WP geodesic ray with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients is determined by the forward ending lamination.

Theorem 1.1. (Narrow Ending Lamination Theorem) *The strong asymptotic class of a WP geodesic ray with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients is determined by the forward ending lamination.*

The strong asymptotic class of a geodesic ray r consist of all the rays r' with $d(r(t), r'(t)) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. The class of WP geodesic rays with narrow ending invariant and bounded annular coefficients contains geodesic rays which are not recurrent to any compact subset of the moduli space (divergent rays) (see [Mod15, §8]). Heuristically these geodesic rays avoid all asymptotic flats in the WP metric and exhibit features of geodesics in manifolds with negative sectional curvatures bounded away from 0. This theorem is a generalization of

Theorem 1.2. (Recurrent Ending Lamination Theorem) [BMM10] *The strong asymptotic class of recurrent WP geodesic rays to a compact subset of the moduli space is determined by the forward ending lamination.*

These results address the parametrization of the visual boundary of the WP metric and characterization of the stable and unstable foliations of the WP geodesic flow using laminations.

To prove Theorem 1.1 we use the control on length-functions along WP geodesics developed in [Mod15] and ruled surfaces as in [BMM10]. The new ingredient here is the strict uniform contraction property of the nearest point projection to WP geodesic segments close to the thick part of a stratum which is not the product of lower complexity strata (Lemma 5.13 and Theorem 5.1). The lemma is proved using Wolpert's estimates on the WP metric, the WP Levi-Civita covariant derivatives and sectional curvatures in the thin part of the Teichmüller space and compactness arguments. There are WP geodesic rays with prescribed itinerary described in Theorem 3.1. Using the contraction property we can guarantee the existence of regions with a definite negative total curvature on ruled surfaces with one side on a ray with prescribed itinerary (see §4 and the proof of Theorem 6.2).

A geodesic ray r in a metric space is visible if for any other geodesic ray r' there is an infinite geodesic (strongly) asymptotic to r in the forward time and (strongly) asymptotic to r' in the backward time. In a complete Riemannian manifold with negative sectional curvatures bounded away from 0 every geodesic ray is visible. For the notion of visibility and some of its dynamical consequences see [Ebe72]. In the regions with a definite negative total curvature as above we are able to pick up enough negative curvature on the ruled surface so that using a variation of the Gauss-Bonnet formula guarantee asymptotic convergence to the ray with prescribed itinerary (Theorem 6.2). Also we overcome the difficulty due to the fact that the sectional curvatures of the WP metric are not bounded away from 0 in the thin part of the Teichmüller space and prove visibility of the class of geodesic rays with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients (Theorem 6.5).

Finally, as an application of our ending lamination theorem we prove a symbolic condition in terms of subsurface coefficients for divergence of WP geodesic rays in the moduli space.

Theorem 6.6. (Divergence condition) *Given $A, R, R' > 0$. Let (ν^-, ν^+) be an $A-$narrow pair on a Riemann surface S with $R'-$bounded annular coefficients, and suppose that $d_S(\nu^-, \nu^+) \leq R$. Then a WP geodesic ray with end invariant (ν^-, ν^+) is divergent in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}(S)$.*

Acknowledgement: I am so grateful to Yair Minsky for many invaluable discussions in the course of this work. I would like to thank Scott Wolpert for several communications related to this work.

2. Background

2.1. **Curve complexes and hierarchy paths.** Let $S = S_{g,b}$ be a compact, orientable surface with genus g and b boundary components. Define the complexity of S by $\xi(S) = 3g - 3 + b$.

The *curve complex* of the surface S, denoted by $\mathcal{C}(S)$, is a flag complex which serves to organize isotopy classes of simple closed curves on a surface. Let $\xi(S) > 1$. Each vertex of the curve complex of S is the isotopy class of an essential simple closed curve. Moreover there is an edge between each pair of isotopy classes with disjoint representatives on S. When $\xi(S) = 1$ (S is a four holed sphere or a one holed torus) an edge is between any pair of isotopy classes of curves with representatives with minimal intersection 1 or 2. Finally let Y be an annulus. Let $\widetilde{Y}$ be the annular cover of S to which Y lifts homeomorphically. There is a natural compactification of $\widetilde{Y}$ to a closed annulus $\widehat{Y}$ which is obtained from the compactification of the universal cover of S by the closed disk. A vertex of $\mathcal{C}(Y)$ is associated to an arc connecting the two boundary components of $\widehat{Y}$ modulo isotopies that fix the endpoints (isotopy classes of arcs relative to the boundary). An edge is between two vertices which have representatives with disjoint interiors.

We equip the curve complex with a distance by making each simplex Euclidean with side lengths 1, and denote the distance by $d_S = d_{\mathcal{C}(S)}$. The curve complex of any annular subsurface is quasi-isometric to $\mathbb{Z}$. Masur and Minsky in [MM99] prove that the curve complex is $\delta-$hyperbolic with δ depending only on the topological type of the surface.

A *multi-curve* on a surface S is a collection of pair wise disjoint curves. Let σ and τ be two multi-curves. We say that σ and τ *overlap* and denote $\sigma \pitchfork \tau$, if there are curves $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \tau$ that intersect each other essentially (can not be realized as disjoint curves on S).

Fix a complete finite area hyperbolic metric on S. A *geodesic lamination* is a closed subset of the surface consisting of complete, simple geodesics. In particular, $\mathcal{C}_0(S) \subset \mathcal{GL}(S)$. Geodesic laminations provide a natural completion for the curve complex. Each geodesic lamination can be equipped with a *transverse measure* (see [PH92]). The pair of a lamination and a transverse measure is a *measured geodesic lamination*. We denote the space of measured geodesic laminations equipped with the weak* topology by $\mathcal{ML}(S)$. $\mathbb{R}^+$ acts by rescaling of measures on $\mathcal{ML}(S)$, each equivalence class is a *projective measured lamination*. We denote the quotient space by $\mathcal{PML}(S)$.

By a result of Klarreich [Kla] the Gromov boundary of the curve complex is identified with $\mathcal{EL}(S)$ the *ending laminations space*. $\mathcal{EL}(S)$ is the image of projective measured laminations with minimal filling support by the measure forgetful map equipped with the topology induced from the topology of $\mathcal{PML}(S)$ via the measure forgetful map.

A *pants decomposition* P is a maximal set of pair wise disjoint curves on the surface. A *(partial) marking* μ is obtained from a pants decomposition P by adding transversal curves to (some) all of the curve in the pants decomposition. We call P the base of μ and denote it by base(μ). The set of

all pants decompositions can be turned into a metric graph called the *pants graph* by putting a length one edge between any two pants decompositions which differ by an elementary move. Similarly the markings can be turned into a metric graph called the *marking graph*. For more detail see [MM00].

Subsurface coefficient: An *essential subsurface* $Y \subseteq S$ is a compact, connected subsurface whose boundary consists of essential curves in S or boundary curves of S which is not a 3−holed sphere. We do not distinguish between a subsurface and its isotopy class.

Let $Y \subseteq S$ be an essential non-annular subsurface. We define the *subsurface projection map*

$$\pi_Y : \mathcal{GL}(S) \to \mathcal{PC}_0(Y)$$

where $\mathcal{PC}_0(Y)$ is the power set of $\mathcal{C}_0(Y)$ as follows: Equip S with a complete hyperbolic metric and realize all curves and laminations geodesically. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$. Suppose that Y is a non-annular subsurface. If $\lambda \cap Y = \emptyset$, then $\pi_Y(\lambda) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, consider the set of arcs with end points on ∂Y or at cusps in the intersection locus $\lambda \cap Y$. Identify all of the curves and arcs that are isotopic. Through the isotopy the end points of arcs are allowed to move within ∂Y. The projection $\pi_Y(\lambda)$ is the union of the boundary curves of a regular neighborhood of $a \cup \partial Y$ where a is an arc we obtained above, and the closed curves we obtained above.

For an annulus Y the subsurface projection is the set of component arcs of the lift of λ to $\widehat{Y}$ (the compactification of the annular cover of S to which Y lifts homeomorphically) that connect the two boundaries of $\widehat{Y}$. For more detail see [MM00, §2].

The projection of a multi-curve σ to a subsurface Y is the union of the projection of all $\alpha \in \sigma$. Let μ be a partial marking. If Y is an annular subsurface with core curve $\alpha \in \text{base}(\mu)$, then $\pi_Y(\mu)$ is the set of transversal curves of α. Otherwise, $\pi_Y(\mu) = \pi_Y(\text{base}(\mu))$.

The Y subsurface coefficient of two laminations or (partial) markings μ and μ' is defined by

$$d_Y(\mu, \mu') = \min\{d_Y(\gamma, \gamma') : \gamma \in \pi_Y(\mu), \gamma' \in \pi_Y(\mu')\}. \tag{2.1}$$

The subsurface coefficients are an analogue of continued fraction expansions of real numbers.

We denote by $\text{diam}_Y(\mu)$ the diameter of $\pi_Y(\mu)$ viewed as a subset of $\mathcal{C}(Y)$. The following lemma is a straightforward consequence of [MM00, Lemma 2.3].

Lemma 2.1. *Let μ be a (partial) marking on a surface S. For any essential subsurface $Y \subseteq S$ we have*

$$\text{diam}_Y(\mu) \leq 2.$$

The *hierarchy paths* introduced by Masur and Minsky in [MM00] comprise a transitive family of quasi-geodesics in the pants graph of a surface

with quantifiers depending only the topological type of the surface. These quasi-geodesics are constructed from hierarchies of geodesics in subsurfaces of a surface. The main feature of hierarchy paths is that their properties are encoded in their end points and the associated subsurface coefficients. For a list of properties see [BMM11], [Mod15]. Let (μ^-, μ^+) be a pair of (partial) markings or laminations. Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ ($[m, n] \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$) be a hierarchy path with $\rho(m) = \mu^-$ and $\rho(n) = \mu^+$. An important property of the hierarchy path is the following: There are subsurfaces Y called component domains, corresponding to each component domain there is a connected subinterval $J_Y \subset [m, n]$ such that $\partial Y \subset \rho(i)$ for all $i \in J_Y$. There is a constant $M_1 > 0$ depending only on the topological type of the surface so that any subsurface Y with $d_Y(\mu^-, \mu^+) > M_1$ is a component domain.

Using the machinery of hierarchies Masur and Minsky establish the following quasi-distance formula. Given $A \geq M_1$, there exist constants $K \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$ such that for any $P, Q \in P(S)$ we have

$$d(P, Q) \asymp_{K,C} \sum_{\substack{Y \subseteq S \\ \text{non-annular}}} \{d_Y(P, Q)\}_A \tag{2.2}$$

Here the cut off function $\{.\}_A : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ is defined by $\{a\}_A = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \geq A \\ 0 & \text{if } a < A \end{cases}$. We call A the threshold constant and K and C the corresponding multiplicative and additive constants.

Here we define two constraints on subsurface coefficients which would be used in this paper.

Definition 2.2. (Narrow pair) Let $A > 0$. An $A-$narrow pair of (partial) markings or laminations (μ^-, μ^+) is a pair such that for an essential subsurface Z if

$$d_Z(\mu^-, \mu^+) > A,$$

then Z is large, i.e. each connected component of $S \backslash Z$ is an annulus or a three holed sphere. In [Mod15] we proved that any hierarchy path between a narrow pair is stable in the pants graph.

Definition 2.3. (Bounded combinatorics) Given $R, R' > 0$. Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path. Let $i, j \in [m, n]$. We say that ρ has non-annular $(R, R')-$bounded combinatorics over $[i, j] \subset J_Z$ if

$$d_Y(\rho(i), \rho(j)) \leq R$$

for every essential non-annular subsurface $Y \subseteq Z$. Moreover for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0(Z)$,

$$d_\gamma(\rho(i), \rho(j)) \leq R'.$$

2.2. **Weil-Petersson metric.** A point in Teich(S), the Teichmüller space of the surface S, is a complete finite area hyperbolic surface equipped with a diffeomorphism $h : S \to x$. The diffeomorphism h is a marking of x. Two marked surfaces $h_1 : S \to x_1$ and $h_2 : S \to x_2$ define the same point in Teich(S) if and only if $h_2 \circ h_1^{-1} : x_1 \to x_2$ is isotopic to an isometry. The moduli space of S, denoted by $\mathcal{M}(S)$, is the quotient of Teich(S) by the action of the mapping class group Mod(S) on Teich(S) by precomposition (remarking).

The $\epsilon-$thick part of the Teichmüller space consists of all $x \in$ Teich(S) with injectivity radius $\text{inj}(x) > \epsilon$. The $\epsilon-$thin part consists of all x with $\text{inj}(x) < \epsilon$. Suppose that ϵ is small enough so that by the Collar lemma (see [Bus10, §4.1]) there is no pair of intersecting closed geodesics of length less than or equal to ϵ on a complete hyperbolic surface. Given a multi-curve σ we define the open regions in Teichmüller space

- $U_\epsilon(\sigma) := \{x \in \text{Teich}(S) : \ell_\alpha(x) < \epsilon \text{ for every } \alpha \in \sigma\}$,
- $U_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}(\sigma) := \{x \in \text{Teich}(S) : \ell_\alpha(x) < \epsilon \text{ for every } \alpha \in \sigma \text{ and } \ell_\gamma(x) > \epsilon' \text{ for every } \gamma \notin \sigma\}$.

For a comprehensive introduction to the Weil-Petersson metric and its properties see [Wol10],[Wol08]. Here we recall some of the properties of the metric which are important for us. The Weil-Petersson (WP) metric is a Riemannian metric with negative sectional curvatures on the Teichmüller space. The metric is incomplete due to possibility of pinching curves along paths with finite WP length. However there is a unique WP geodesic between any two points in the Teichmüller space so the metric is geodesically convex. The WP sectional curvatures are negative and asymptotic to both 0 and $-\infty$ asymptotic to completion. The completion is a CAT(0) metric. The metric is invariant under the action of Mod(S) and descends under the natural orbifold cover to a metric on $\mathcal{M}(S)$.

The Weil-Petersson completion of the Teichmüller space $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ is the disjoint union of $\sigma-$strata denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ where σ is a multi-curve. $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ consists of nodal Riemann surfaces at σ. Equivalently each point in $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ is a marked complete hyperbolic surface with a pair of cusps for each curve in σ. The WP completion of the Teichmüller space descends to the Deligne-Mumford compactification of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$. $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$ is the union of finitely many strata. Each stratum is the quotient of the strata of $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ identified by the natural extension of the action of Mod(S) to the completion.

The WP metric has *non-refraction property* as follows: Given $x, y \in \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$, the interior of the unique geodesic connecting x and y is in the smallest stratum (with respect to inclusion of strata) that contains x and y. The following strengthened version of Wolpert's Geodesic Limit Theorem (see [Wol03] and [BMM11]) proved in §4 of [Mod15] provides a limiting picture for a sequence of bounded length WP geodesic segments in the Teichmüller space. We need this result for compactness arguments in §5.

Theorem 2.4. (Geodesic Limits) *Given $T > 0$. Let $\zeta_n : [0,T] \to \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ be a sequence of WP geodesic segments parametrized by arc-length. After possibly passing to a subsequence there is a partition $0 = t_0 < .... < t_{k+1} = T$ of $[0,T]$, possibly empty multi-curves $\sigma_0, ..., \sigma_{k+1}$ and a multi-curve $\hat{\tau} \equiv \sigma_i \cap \sigma_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, 1, ..., k$ and a piece-wise geodesic*

$$\hat{\zeta} : [0,T] \to \overline{\text{Teich}(S)},$$

with the following properties

(1) $\hat{\zeta}((t_i, t_{i+1})) \subset \mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau})$ for $i = 0, ..., k$,

(2) $\hat{\zeta}(t_i) \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma_i)$ for $i = 1, ..., k$,

Given a multi-curve σ denote by $\text{tw}(\sigma)$ the subgroup of $\text{Mod}(S)$ generated by positive Dehn twists about curves in σ. There are elements of the mapping class group ψ_n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that either $\psi_n \equiv I$ or ψ_n is an unbounded sequence, and $\mathcal{T}_{i,n} \in \text{tw}(\sigma_i - \hat{\tau})$ for any $i = 1, ..., k+1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

(3) For any $t \in [0, t_1]$, $\psi_n(\zeta_n(t)) \to \hat{\zeta}(t)$ as $n \to \infty$. For each $i = 1, ..., k$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\varphi_{i,n} = \mathcal{T}_{i,n} \circ ... \circ \mathcal{T}_{1,n} \circ \psi_n$. Then for any $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1}]$, $\varphi_{i,n}(\zeta_n(t)) \to \hat{\zeta}(t)$, as $n \to \infty$.

2.3. **End invariants.** There is a constant L_S depending only on the topological type of the surface S with the property that any complete finite area hyperbolic metric on S has a pants decomposition called the *Bers pants decomposition* such that the length of every curve in P is at most L_S (see [Bus10, §5]). A Bers curve is a curve in a Bers pants decomposition. A *Bers marking* is a (partial) marking obtained from a Bers pants decomposition by adding transversal curves with representatives of minimal length. Given a point $x \in \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$, suppose that $x \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. A Bers pants decomposition of x, denoted by $Q(x)$, is the union of Bers pants decompositions of the connected components of $S \backslash \sigma$ and σ. A Bers marking of x, denoted by $\mu(x)$, is obtained from $Q(x)$ with no transversal for curve in σ.

By Brock's Quasi-Isometry Theorem [Bro03] the coarse map

$$Q : \overline{\text{Teich}(S)} \to P(S)$$

which assigns to $x \in \text{Teich}(S)$ a Bers pants decomposition of x is a quasi-isometry with constants $K_{\text{WP}} \geq 1$ and $C_{\text{WP}} \geq 0$ depending only on the topological type of S.

Definition 2.5. (Ending measured lamination) The weak* limit in $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ of any weighted sequence of distinct Bers curves along a WP geodesic ray r is an ending measured lamination of r.

Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_0(S)$. The $\alpha-$length-function assigns to a point $x \in \text{Teich}(S)$ the length of the geodesic representative of α on the hyperbolic surface x. This notion of length-function has a natural extension to the space of measured laminations $\mathcal{ML}(S)$. Let $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$. We denote the $\mathcal{L}-$length-function a the point x by $\mathcal{L}$ by $\ell_{\mathcal{L}}(x)$.

The convexity of length-functions along WP geodesics proved by Wolpert (see e.g [Wol10, §3]) asserts that

Theorem 2.6. *Let g be a WP geodesic. For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_0(S)$, $\ell_\alpha(g(t))$ is a convex function. Similarly, for any $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$, $\ell_{\mathcal{L}}(g(t))$ is a convex function.*

In [BMM11] the following notion of *ending lamination* for WP geodesic rays is introduced. Its existence relies on the convexity of length-functions along WP geodesics and properties of CAT(0) spaces. Let $r : [0, a) \to \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ be a WP geodesic ray.

Definition 2.7. (Ending Lamination) The union of pinching curves along a WP geodesic ray r and the geodesic laminations arising as supports of all ending measured laminations of r is the ending lamination of r.

Here a pinching curve of r is a curve α such that $\ell_\alpha(r(t)) \to 0$ as $t \to a$.

Definition 2.8. (End invariant of Weil-Petersson geodesics) To each open end of a geodesic $g : (a, b) \to \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ $(0 \in (a, b))$ we associate an end invariant which is a partial marking or a lamination. If the forward trajectory $g|_{[0,b)}$ can be extended to b such that $g(b) \in \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ then the forward end invariant $\nu^+(g)$ is any Bers marking $\mu(g(b))$ (there are finitely many of them). Otherwise, $\nu^+(g)$ is the ending lamination of the forward trajectory ray $g|_{[0,b)}$ which was defined above. We define the backward end invariant $\nu^-(g)$ similarly by considering the backward trajectory $g|_{[0,a)}$. We call the pair (ν^-, ν^+) the end invariant of g.

We recall two important properties of the ending measured laminations proved in [BMM10, §2].

Lemma 2.9. (Decreasing of length along WP geodesic rays) *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be any ending measured lamination of a WP geodesic ray r, then $\ell_{\mathcal{L}}(r(t))$ is a decreasing function.*

Lemma 2.10. *Let $r_n \to r$ be a convergent sequence of rays in the WP visual sphere at x. Then if $\mathcal{L}_n$ is any sequence of ending measured laminations or weighted pinching curves for r_n, any representative $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ of the limit of the projective classes $[\mathcal{L}_n]$ in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$ has bounded length along the ray r.*

Let ν^+ be a measurable geodesic lamination. Suppose that there is a collection of pairwise disjoint subsurfaces Z_a, $a = 1, ..., m$, with $\xi(Z_a) \geq 1$ so that: any simple closed curve in $S \setminus \cup_{a=1}^m Z_a$ is isotopic to a boundary curve of one of the subsurfaces Z_a. Moreover ν_a the restriction of ν^+ to Z_a is minimal and fills Z_a. For each $a = 1, ..., m$ let $\mathcal{L}_a$ be a measured lamination supported on ν_a. Let $\gamma_n^a \in \mathcal{C}(Z_a)$ be a sequence of curves so that the projective classes $[\gamma_n^a]$ converge to $[\mathcal{L}_a]$ as $n \to \infty$ in $\mathcal{PML}(Z_a)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let Q_n be a pants decomposition that contains $\{\partial Z_a, \gamma_n^a\}_{a=1}^m$.

Let c_n be a maximally nodal hyperbolic surface at Q_n. Let $[x, c_n]$ be the WP geodesic segment connecting a base point x in the interior of the Teichmüller space to c_n. Denote the parametrization of $[x, c_n]$ by arc-length by r_n. In [Mod15, §8] we proved

Lemma 2.11. (Infinite ray) *After possibly passing to a subsequence the geodesic segments r_n converge to an infinite ray r in the visual sphere of the WP metric at x. Moreover, the length of each measured lamination $\mathcal{L}_a$, $a = 1, ..., m$, and each curve $\alpha \in \partial Z_a$ is bounded along r.*

Let (ν^-, ν^+) be a narrow pair. The narrow condition implies that there is at most one subsurface Y with $\xi(Y) \geq 1$ so that the restriction of ν^+ to Y is minimal and fills Y. Suppose that such a component exists. Let ρ be a hierarchy between ν^- and ν^+. There is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\partial Y \subset \rho(n + N).$$

Note that if $Y = S$ the the above statement is vacuous. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q_n = \rho(n + N)$. Let γ_n be a curve in $\pi_Y(Q_n)$. After possibly passing to a subsequence the projective classes of γ_n converge to the projective class of a measured geodesic lamination supported on ν'. Let x be a point with a Bers marking ν^-. Let c_n be the maximally nodal hyperbolic surface at Q_n. Let as before r be the limit of the geodesic segments $[x, c_n]$ after possibly passing to a subsequence. In [Mod15, §8] we proved that

Lemma 2.12. *The forward ending lamination of r contains ν'.*

3. Combinatorial control

Let $g : [a, b] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic with $A-$narrow end invariant (ν^-, ν^+). Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path between ν^- and ν^+. In [Mod15, §5] we proved that a hierarchy path with narrow end points is $d-$stable. Where $d : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ is the quantifier function of the stability which depends only on A. Thus $Q(g)$ and ρ, $D-$fellow-travel each other where D depends only on A and the topological type of S. Moreover, since both $Q(g)$ and ρ are quasi-geodesics with quantifiers depending only on the topological type of the surface S, there is a coarse parameter map N from $[m, n]$ to $[a, b]$ such that

$$|N(i) - N(j)| \asymp_{K,C} |i - j|, \tag{3.1}$$

where the constants $K \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$ depend only on A (see [Mod15, §5.3]).

The following theorem from [Mod15, §8] provides us a *WP geodesic ray with a prescribed itinerary* in the Teichmüller space.

Theorem 3.1. (Infinite ray with prescribed itinerary) *Given $A, R, R' > 0$, there are constants $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(A, R, R', \epsilon)$ and $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}(A, R')$ with the following properties.*

Let (ν^-, ν^+) be an $A-$narrow pair. Let ρ be a hierarchy path between ν^- and ν^+. Let $r_{\nu^\pm} : [0, \infty) \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be the infinite WP geodesic ray

as in Lemma 2.12. Suppose that Z a large component domain of ρ has $(R, R')-$bounded combinatorics over an interval $[m', n'] \subset J_Z$ with $n' - m' > 2\bar{w}$. Then

(1) $\ell_\gamma(r_{\nu^\pm}(t)) > \bar{\epsilon}$ for every $\gamma \notin \partial Z$, and
(2) $\ell_\alpha(r_{\nu^\pm}(t)) \leq \epsilon$ for every $\alpha \in \partial Z$

for every $t \in [a', b']$, where $a' \in N(m' + \bar{w})$ and $b' \in N(n' - \bar{w})$.

Moreover, if Z_1 and Z_2 are subsurfaces as above, $n_1' < m_2'$ implies that $b_1' < a_2'$.

3.1. **Bounding annular coefficients.** Let $r_{\nu^\pm} : [0, \infty) \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic ray with prescribed itinerary with $A-$narrow end invariant and $R'-$bounded annular coefficients. In this subsection we show that given $a > 0$ and any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ there is a subinterval of length at least a of any long enough subinterval of $[0, \infty)$ over which $r_{\nu^\pm}$ is in some $U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}$ region of the Teichmüller space. Here $\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}(A, R')$ is the constant from Theorem 3.1. This combinatorial control will be used in §5.

Here we recall two properties of hierarchy paths which will be used in this section. For an extended list of properties see [Mod15, §2], [BMM11, §2].

Theorem 3.2. *There exist positive constants M_2 and M_3 depending only on the topological type of S so that: Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path between partial markings or laminations μ^- and μ^+. Let Z be a component domain of ρ and let $J_Z = [j^-, j^+]$. Then*

(1) For every $i \leq j^-$, $d_Z(\rho(j^-), \mu^-) \leq M_2$ and for every $i \geq j^+$, $d_Z(\rho(i), \mu^+) \leq M_2$.
(2) (No backtracking) Let $i, j, k \in [m, n]$ with $i \leq j \leq k$. Then for any subsurface $Y \subseteq S$,

$$d_Y(\rho(i), \rho(k)) + M_3 \geq d_Y(\rho(i), \rho(j)) + d_Y(\rho(j), \rho(k)).$$

Lemma 3.3. *Given an increasing function $F : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ there is an $L > 0$, depending only on F and the topological type of S with the following property. Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path. Suppose that a subinterval $[m', n'] \subseteq [m, n]$ has the property that for any subsurface Z and any $R > 0$, if Z has non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics over a subinterval $[k, l] \subset [m', n']$, then $d_Z(\rho(l), \rho(k)) \leq F(R)$. Then we have that $n' - m' \leq L$.*

Proof. Let $\xi(S)$ be the complexity of the surface S. For each $i = 0, 1, ..., \xi(S)$ define the constants

$$x_i = \max\{d_Y(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) : Y \subseteq S \text{ is non-annular and } \xi(Y) \leq i\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that for $i = 0$, the set on the right-hand side is empty and $x_0 = 0$.

Claim 3.4. Let $i \in \{1, ..., \xi(S)\}$. For any essential subsurface $Z \subseteq S$ with $\xi(Z) = i$ we have

$$d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) \leq F(x_{i-1}) + 2M_2 + 4.$$

The proof of the claim is by contradiction. Suppose that the claim does not hold. Then there is a non-annular subsurface Z with $\xi(Z) = i$ such that

$$d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) > F(x_{i-1}) + 2M_2 + 4. \tag{3.3}$$

Claim 3.5. Suppose that (3.3) holds. Then $J_Z \cap [m', n'] \neq \emptyset$.

Let $J_Z = [j^-, j^+]$. Suppose that the claim does not hold, then $[j^-, j^+] \cap [m', n'] = \emptyset$. Then either $n' < j^-$ or $j^+ < m'$. Suppose that $n' < j^-$, then by Theorem 3.2(1) we have $d_Z(\rho(n'), \mu^-) \leq M_2$. Moreover since $m' < n' < j^-$ by Theorem 3.2(1), $d_Z(\rho(m'), \mu^-) \leq M_2$. The last two inequalities combined by the triangle inequality give us

$$d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) \leq 2M_2 + \mathrm{diam}_Z(\mu^-) \leq 2M_2 + 2.$$

The second inequality above follows from Lemma 2.1. But this contradicts the bound (3.3) we assumed to hold. Now suppose that $m' > j^+$, then by Theorem 3.2(1) of hierarchy paths, $d_Z(\rho(m'), \mu^+) \leq M_2$. Moreover since $n' > m' > j^+$ by Theorem 3.2(1) we have $d_Z(\rho(n'), \mu^+) \leq M_2$. The last two inequalities combined by the triangle inequality imply that

$$d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) \leq 2M_2 + 2.$$

Which again contradict the bound (3.3). This finishes the proof of Claim 3.5.

By Claim 3.5 we have $J_Z \cap [m', n'] \neq \emptyset$. Let the interval $[k, l] = J_Z \cap [m', n']$. We proceed to show that

$$d_Z(\rho(k), \rho(l)) \geq F(x_{i-1}). \tag{3.4}$$

If $[m', n'] \subseteq J_Z$, then $[k, l] = [m', n']$ and (3.4) follows immediately from the bound (3.3).

If $[k, l] = [j^-, n']$, then by the triangle inequality and Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(j^-)) + d_Z(\rho(j^-), \rho(n')) &\geq d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) - \mathrm{diam}_Z(\rho(j^-)) \\ &\geq d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover $m' < j^-$ so by Theorem 3.2(1),

$$d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(j^-)) \leq M_2.$$

The above two inequalities and the ineqiality (3.3) imply that

$$d_Z(\rho(j^-), \rho(n')) \geq F(x_{i-1}) + M_2.$$

Then the bound (3.4) follows.

If $[k, l] = [m', j^+]$, then similar to above we can get the bound

$$d(\rho(m'), \rho(j^+)) \geq F(x_{i-1}) + M_2,$$

which gives us the bound (3.4).

Finally if $J_Z \subseteq [m', n']$, then Theorem 3.2(1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(j^-)) &\leq M_2 \text{ and} \\ d_Z(\rho(n'), \rho(j^+)) &\leq M_2. \end{aligned}$$

The above two inequalities and (3.3) combined by the triangle imply that

$$d_Z(\rho(j^-), \rho(j^+)) \geq F(x_{i-1}),$$

which is the bound (3.4). This finishes establishing of (3.4).

Now by the set up of the constants x_i in (3.2) the subsurface Z has non-annular $x_{i-1}-$bounded combinatorics over the subinterval $[k, l] \subseteq [m', n']$ and by (3.4),

$$d_Z(\rho(k), \rho(l)) \geq F(x_{i-1}).$$

But this contradicts the assumption of the lemma. Claim 3.4 follows from this contradiction.

By Claim 3.4, for each $i \in \{1, ..., \xi(S)\}$,

$$\max\{d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) : \xi(Z) = i\} \leq F(x_{i-1}) + 2M_2 + 4,$$

moreover from the set up of the constants x_i in (3.2) is clear that

$$x_i = \max\{x_{i-1}, \max\{d_Z(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) : \xi(Z) = i\}\},$$

so we have the following bound

$$x_i \leq \max\{x_{i-1}, F(x_{i-1}) + 2M_2 + 4\}. \tag{3.5}$$

To simplify the notation we define the function $f(x) = \max\{x, F(x)+2M_2+4\}$. By (3.5), $x_i \leq f(x_{i-1})$, moreover $x_0 = 0$. Then we may deduce inductively that for each $i \in \{1, ..., \xi(S)\}$,

$$x_i \leq f^i(0). \tag{3.6}$$

Here f^i denotes the $i-$th composition of f with itself.

Since f is an increasing function and $f(0) \geq 0$, we have $\max\{f^i(0) : i = 1, 2, ..., \xi(S)\} = f^{\xi(S)}(0)$. Then by the bound (3.6) we have

$$\max\{x_i : i = 1, 2, ..., \xi(S)\} \leq f^{\xi(S)}(0).$$

So by the set up of the constants x_i in (3.2) we have

$$d_Y(\rho(m'), \rho(n')) \leq f^{\xi(S)}(0) \tag{3.7}$$

for all non-annular subsurfaces $Y \subseteq S$. Let $A_1 = \max\{M_1, f^{\xi(S)}(0)\}$ be the threshold constant in the distance formula (2.2). Let C_1 be the additive constant corresponding to A_1. Then by (3.7) we have

$$d(\rho(n'), \rho(m') \leq C_1.$$

Moreover, ρ is a $(k, c)-$quasi-geodesic where k and c depend only on the topological type of S, so we obtain the upper bound $L = kC_1 + kc$ for $n' - m'$. Note that L only depends on F and the topological type of S. The proof of the lemma is complete. □

Lemma 3.6. *Given $A, d, R' > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there are constants $L' > 0$ and $\bar{w} > 0$ with the following properties. Let (ν^-, ν^+) be an $A-$narrow pair with $R'-$bounded annular coefficients. Let $\rho : [m, n] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path between ν^- and ν^+. Let $r_{\nu^\pm} : [a, b) \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic ray with prescribed itinerary with end invariant (ν^-, ν^+). Then for any $[m', n'] \subseteq [m, n]$ with $m' - n' \geq L'$, there is a subinterval $[k, l] \subset [m', n']$ and Z a large component domain of ρ such that for $t^- \in N(k + \bar{w})$ and $t^+ \in N(l - \bar{w})$ we have $r_{\nu^\pm}(t) \in U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z)$ for every $t \in [t^-, t^+]$. Moreover, $t^+ - t^- \geq d$. Here N is the parameter correspondence map.*

Proof. Fix a threshold constant $A_1 \geq M_1$ for the distance formula (2.2) and let K_1, C_1 be the corresponding constants. Note that the hierarchy path ρ is a $(k, c)-$quasi-geodesic where k, c depend only on the topological type of the surface. Let $K_2 = K_1 k$ and $C_2 = K_1 k(C_1 + c)$. Let K, C be the constants for N from (3.1). Let M_3 be the constant from Theorem 3.2(2). Let $\bar{w}$ be the constant from Theorem 3.1. Define the function

$$F(x) = \max\{K_2\big(2\bar{w}(A, x, R' + 2M_3, \epsilon) + (Kd + KC)\big) + C_2, A\}.$$

Now let L' be the constant from Lemma 3.3 for the the function F defined above. For any $[m', n'] \subseteq [m, n]$ with $n' - m' \geq L'$ by the contrapositive of Lemma 3.3, there are $R > 0$, a subsurface Z and an interval $[k, l] \subseteq [m', n'] \cap J_Z$ such that $d_Z(\rho(k), \rho(l)) > F(R)$ and Z has non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics over $[k, l]$. Since ρ is $A-$narrow and $F(R) \geq A$ the subsurface Z is a large subsurface. Thus for any non-annular subsurface Y, either $Y \subseteq Z$ or $Y \pitchfork Z$ holds. If $Y \subseteq Z$, then since $\partial Z \subset \rho(l), \rho(k)$ we have $d_Y(\rho(k), \rho(l)) \leq 2$. If $Y \pitchfork Z$, then by the non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics we have $d_Y(\rho(k), \rho(l)) \leq R$. Then by the distance formula (2.2) and the fact that Z has $R-$bounded combinatorics over $[k, l]$, we have

$$d(\rho(l), \rho(k)) \geq \frac{1}{K_1}\{d_Z(\rho(l), \rho(k))\}_{A_1} - C_1.$$

As we saw above $d_Z(\rho(k), \rho(l)) > F(R)$ so

$$d(\rho(l), \rho(k)) \geq k(2\bar{w}(A, R, R' + 2M_3, \epsilon) + (Kd + KC)) + kc.$$

Moreover, ρ is a $(k, c)-$quasi-geodesic so

$$k - l > 2\bar{w}(A, R, R' + 2M_3, \epsilon) + Kd + KC.$$

Furthermore, by assumption of the lemma, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0(S)$, $d_\gamma(\nu^-, \nu^+) \leq R'$. Then by Theorem 3.2(2), $d_\gamma(\rho(k), \rho(l)) \leq R' + 2M_3$. Therefore, Z has $(R, R' + 2M_3)-$bounded combinatorics over $[k, l]$. Set $\bar{w} = \bar{w}(A, R, R' + 2M_3, \epsilon)$. Then the lemma follows from applying Theorem 3.1 to the interval $[k, l]$. □

4. Variation of geodesics

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a geodesically convex, negatively curved, Riemannian manifold. For example the Teichmüller space equipped with the WP metric. Let g :

$[a,b] \to \mathcal{X}$ be a geodesic segment. Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to g$ be the nearest point projection from $\mathcal{X}$ to g. Here we collect some facts about the map π.

(1) Suppose that p is a point so that $\pi(p)$ is in the interior of $g([a,b])$ or is an end point $g(a)$ or $g(b)$ which is the nearest point to p on a slightly longer geodesic segment containing $g([a,b])$. Then as is shown in Lemma 3.2 of [BO69] the projection map π is continuous at p.
(2) Let p be a point as in (1). Let ζ be a geodesic segment connecting p to $\pi(p)$. Then ζ is orthogonal to g at $\pi(p)$. This follows from Proposition 1.7 of [CE08].
(3) Since g is a smooth path, $N(g)$ the normal bundle of g is a smooth bundle. Then the exponential map $\exp_{g(t)} s\vec{n} : N(g(t)) \to \mathcal{X}$ defines a smooth map. Let p be a point as in (1). Then by (2), ζ is orthogonal to g at $\pi(p)$. Thus ζ coincide with $\exp_{g(t)} s\vec{n}$ for some normal vector $\vec{n}$ to g at $g(t)$.
(4) Let p be a point as in (1) so that $p \notin g$. Suppose that $\pi(p) = g(t)$. Let $N^\epsilon(g) = \{v \in N(g(t)) : ||v|| \leq \epsilon\}$. For $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently small, $N^\epsilon(g)$ is a smooth submanifold of $\mathcal{X}$. Moreover $\exp_{g(t)} s\vec{n}$ is a diffeomorphism from $N^\epsilon(g(t))$ onto $g(I)$ where $I \subset [a,b]$ and $p \in g(I)$. The lemma on the first page of [Foo84] asserts that the nearest point projection on a smooth submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is smooth. Then an argument similar to the one given for the proof of the lemma shows that π is smooth at p.
(5) As is shown in Theorem 1 of [Foo84] the distance function $d(p, \pi(p))$ is smooth.

Let $g_1 : [a,b] \to \mathcal{X}$ and $g_2 : [c,d] \to \mathcal{X}$ be two geodesic segments parametrized by arclength. Let $g_1(t)$ be a point with projection in the interior of $g_2([c,d])$. By (3), π is smooth at $g_1(t)$. Furthermore, g_1 is a smooth path, so $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$ is a smooth family of geodesic segments ($t \in [a,b]$). This follows from the fact that by (4) the end points of $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$ vary smoothly. Moreover, since $\mathcal{X}$ is a negatively curved manifold, any two of the geodesic segments $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$ fellow travel each other all the way. Finally, let $f : [a,b] \to g_2([c,d])$ be the reparametrization of g_2 which maps $t \in [a,b]$ to $\pi(g_1(t))$. Then f is smooth.

Let $\triangle = \{(t,s) : t \in [a,b] \text{ and } s \in [0, \lambda(t)]\}$, where $\lambda(t)$ is the length of the geodesic segment $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$. For any $t \in [a,b]$, let $u(t,s)$ be the arclength parametrization of $[g_1(t), g_1(\pi(t))]$ where s is the parameter and $u(t,0) = \pi(g_1(t))$. Then by (4), $(t,s) \to u(t,s)$ defines a smooth map $u : \triangle \to \mathcal{X}$. For any $t \in [a,b]$, $u(t,s) = \exp_{g(t)} s\vec{n}$ is a geodesic parametrized by s. By (4) and (5) for any $s > 0$, $u(t,s)$ is a smooth path parametrized by t. Then u is a variation of geodesics $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$ and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ is a Jacobi field.

Given s, $(.,s)$ defines a vertical coordinate line and given t, $(t,.)$ defines a horizontal coordinate line in $\triangle \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. See Figure 1.



FIGURE 1. The variation of geodesics u is the family of geodesic segments connecting points of the geodesic segment g_1 to their nearest points on the geodesic segment g_2. We pull back of the metric of $\mathcal{X}$ by u to the region $\triangle$ in the (t, s) plane.

We pull back the metric of $\mathcal{X}$ to $\triangle$ by u. Let the interval $I \subset [a, b]$ and $s, s' > 0$ with $s' < s$ be such that $I \times s \subset \triangle$ and $I \times s' \subset \triangle$. The main result of this section is Lemma 4.4, where we prove that a difference in the length of $I \times s$ and $I \times s'$ gives rise to a definite total Gaussian curvature of the region $I \times [s', s] \subset \triangle$. For this purpose using the Gauss-Bonnet formula we prove the formula (4.4).

Let $k_g(t, s)$ be the the geodesic curvature of the path $u(., s)$ at $u(t, s)$, where the normal vector $\vec{n}$ of the path is the one with $\langle \vec{n}(u(t, s)), \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}(t, s) \rangle < 0$.

Theorem 4.1. *The pull back metric has the following properties:*

(I) Each vertical coordinate line is a geodesic.
(II) Vertical and horizontal coordinate lines intersect each other orthogonally.
(III) There is a $k < 0$ such that the Gaussian curvature $\kappa \leq k$.
(IV) The distance between any two vertical coordinate lines is increasing in s, so for any $I \subseteq [a, b]$ if $s \geq s'$ then $\text{length}(I \times s) \geq \text{length}(I \times s')$.
(V) The function $-k_g$ is non-negative along each horizontal coordinate line.

Proof. The path $u(t, .)$ is a geodesic in $\mathcal{X}$, so (I) follows. The paths $u(t, .)$ and $u(., s)$ intersect orthogonally in $\mathcal{X}$ so (II) follows.

The family of geodesic segments $[g_1(t), \pi(g_1(t))]$ $(t \in [a, b])$ lies in a compact part of $\mathcal{X}$. Thus the sectional curvatures of the metric are bounded above by some $k < 0$. Then (III) follows. Exercise II.16 on page 104 of [Cha06] asserts that: The Gaussian curvature of the ruled surface obtained from a geodesic variation at any point is less than or equal to the sectional

curvature of the tangent plane of the surface at that point. This implies (III).

The geodesic variation u we described before lies in a region of $\mathcal{X}$ with sectional curvatures bounded above by a $k < 0$ (see the proof of part (III)). It is a standard fact that for $u(t, s)$ a smooth geodesic variation as we set above in a manifold with constant negative sectional curvature k the length of a Jacobi field defined by $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ is increasing along $u(t, s)$ as s increases. (This fact follows from the explicit formula for the Jacobi fields in a constant negative curvature manifold given in [Cha06, §II.5]). Then the Rauch comparison theorem for the region in $\mathcal{X}$ with sectional curvatures bounded above by k and a manifold with constant curvature k, implies that the length of the Jacobi field $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ is increasing. For the detail about the Rauch comparison theorem see e.g. §11 of Chapter 1 of [CE08]. So we may conclude that $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{(t,s)} \geq \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{(t,s')}$ for any t and any s, s' with $s \geq s'$. Moreover, $\text{length}(u(I \times s)) = \int_I \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{(t,s)} dt$. Then using the inequality we just got we have

$$\text{length}(u(I \times s)) \geq \text{length}(u(I \times s')),$$

and therefore (IV) follows.

Let $I = [a', b']$ be a subinterval of the interval $[a, b]$. We may consider u as a variation of paths $u|_{I \times s}$. Then by the first variation of arc-length formula (see e.g. page 4 of [CE08]) we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} \text{length}(I \times s) = \langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \rangle \Big|_{a'}^{b'} - \int_{I \times s} \langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \rangle dt.$$

By (II) we have that $\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} \rangle \equiv 0$, so the first term on the right hand-side of the above formula is 0. Moreover by definition $k_g := \langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \rangle$. Thus we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} \text{length}(u(I \times s)) = \int_{I \times s} -k_g(t, s) dt. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, by (IV), $\frac{d}{ds} \text{length}(u(I \times s)) \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\int_{I \times s} -k_g \geq 0.$$

Since I was an arbitrary subinterval of $[a, b]$, from the fact that the integral of $-k_g$ is positive over I we can conclude that the function $-k_g$ is a non-negative function on the interval $[a, b]$. This is the statement (V). □

4.1. **Gauss-Bonnet formula.** By Theorem 4.1(V) the integral of the function $-k_g$ along any horizontal coordinate line $(., s)$ with respect to the arc-length defines a positive measure m_s on $(., s)$.

Suppose that $V \times W \subset \triangle$. Let $I \subseteq V$ and $[s', s] \subset W$. By the Gauss-Bonnet formula (page 242 of [Cha06]) for the pull back metric on $I \times [s', s]$ we have

$$\int \int_{I \times [s',s]} \kappa dA + \int_{\partial(I \times [s',s])} k_g dt = 2\pi - \sum_i \theta_i.$$

The orientations of boundary curves in the line integral above are shown in Figure 1. By Theorem 4.1(I) each $t \times (s', s)$ is a geodesic. The sum above is over the exterior angles at the four corners of $I \times [s', s]$. By Theorem 4.1(II) each exterior angle is equal to $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so the exterior angles add up to 2π. Therefore we get

$$-\int_{I\times s} k_g dt + \int_{I\times s'} k_g dt + \int\int_{I\times[s',s]} \kappa dA = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

after rearrangement we have

$$\int_{I\times s'} k_g dt = \int_{I\times s} k_g dt + \int\int_{I\times[s',s]} -\kappa dA. \tag{4.3}$$

Claim 4.2. The limit of the left hand-side of (4.3) exists as $s' \to 0$.

First by Theorem 4.1(V) for every $s' > 0$, $k_g \leq 0$, so the left hand-side of (4.3) is non-positive. Thus the right-hand side of (4.3) is non-positive as well. Second by Theorem 4.1(III), $\kappa \leq 0$, so the second term on the right-hand side is increasing as $s' \to 0$. Thus the left-hand side is increasing as $s' \to 0$. As a result the left-hand side is a non-positive function and increases as $s' \to 0$. Thus the limit of the left-hand side exits as $s' \to 0$. Furthermore, since the equality holds for every $s' > 0$ it holds at $s' = 0$ as well. The claim is proved.

Since Claim 4.2 holds for every subinterval of I, the weak* limit of the measures m_s exists. Denote by m the measure obtained as the weak* limit of the measures m_s. Then taking limit as $s' \to 0$ in (4.3) we obtain the following formula

$$\int\int_{I\times[0,s]} \kappa dA - \int_{I\times 0} m - \int_{I\times s} k_g dt = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Consider the regions in $\triangle$ below the horizontal lines (see Figure 1). Define the measures m_s on the horizontal coordinate lines $(., s) \cap \triangle$ by integrating $-k_g$. Let the measure m be the limit of the measures m_s as $s \to 0$. Then the argument given above to prove the formula (4.4) gives us the following formula

$$\int\int_{\triangle} \kappa dA - \int_{[a,b]\times 0} m = 2\pi - \sum_i \theta_i, \tag{4.5}$$

where the sum is over the exterior angles of the region $\triangle$.

4.2. **A length versus total curvature estimate.** Let as before $V \times W \subset \triangle$. Let $I \subseteq V$ be a subinterval, let $s, s' \in W$ with $s' \leq s$, define

$$\phi(s, s') = \begin{cases} \int\int_{I\times[s',s]} -\kappa dA - \int_{I\times s'} k_g dt & \text{if } s' > 0 \\ \int\int_{I\times[0,s]} -\kappa dA + \int_{I\times 0} m & \text{if } s' = 0 \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

For any $s \in W$ let

$$l_s = \text{length}(u(I \times s)).$$

Then l_s is positive and by Theorem 4.1(IV) decreases as $s \to 0$ so $\lim_{s\to 0} l_s$ exists. We denote $l_0 = \lim_{s\to 0} l_s$.

Remark 4.3. Note that l_0 is not necessarily equal to length$(u(I \times 0))$.

Lemma 4.4. *For any $s, s' \in W$ with $s' \leq s$, we have*

$$\phi(s, s') \geq \frac{l_s - l_{s'}}{s - s'}.$$

Proof. First we prove the following integral formula:

$$\begin{aligned} l_s - l_{s'} &= \int_{s'}^{s} \frac{dl_r}{dr} dr \\ &= \int_{s'}^{s} \Big(\int_{I\times r} -k_g dt \Big) dr \\ &= \int_{s'}^{s} \Big(\int\int_{I\times[s',r]} -\kappa dA + \int_{I\times s'} -k_g dt \Big) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

The first equality is the Fundamental theorem of calculus applied to l_r as a function of r. The second equality holds by the first variation of arc-length formula (4.1) for the orthogonal variation of paths $u|_{I\times s}$. The last equality holds by the Gauss-Bonnet formula (4.2).

Suppose that $s > 0$ and $r, s' \in (0, s]$ with $r \geq s'$. By the set up of ϕ in (4.6), $\phi(s, r) \leq \phi(s, s')$. So we have

$$\textstyle\int_{s'}^{s} \phi(s, r) dr \leq \int_{s'}^{s} \phi(s, s') dr = \phi(s, s')(s - s'),$$

then using (4.7) we have

$$l_s - l_{s'} \leq \phi(s, s')(s - s').$$

This proves the lemma for any $s' > 0$.

We proceed to show that the lemma holds at $s' = 0$ as well. For any fixed $r < s$ by (4.3) the integrands $-\kappa$ and $-k_g$ in the last line of (4.7) do not depend on s'. So the limit as $s' \to 0$ of the last line of (4.7) is $\int_0^s \phi(0, r) dr$. Thus $l_s - l_0 = \int_0^s \phi(0, r) dr$. Moreover, by (4.6), for $s \geq r$, $\phi(s, 0) \geq \phi(r, 0)$. So we have

$$l_s - l_0 \leq \int_0^s \phi(r, 0) dr \leq s\phi(s, 0).$$

Thus the lemma holds for $s' = 0$ as well. □

Remark 4.5. If the variation of geodesics u extends to a variation that contains $g_1([a, b])$ in its interior, then the second term of $\phi(0, s)$ in (4.6) vanishes. Defining the measure m and the rather long discussion of this section meant to handle the possibility that the variation does not extend. For example when the nearest point projection onto $g_1([a, b])$ maps a subinterval to a point in the interior of $g_1([a, b])$.

5. Contraction property of WP geodesic segments

Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a geodesically convex, negatively curved Riemannian manifold. For example the Teichmüller space equipped with the WP metric. Let $g : [0,T] \to \mathcal{X}$ be a geodesic segment. Let $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to g([0,T])$ denote the nearest point projection from $\mathcal{X}$ to $g([0,T])$. Recall the facts (1)-(5) about the map π at the begging of §4. At a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\pi(p)$ in the interior of $g([0,T])$, π is smooth and has a linear derivative $d\pi : T_p\mathcal{X} \to T_{\pi(p))}g$ (by (4)). At a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$, with $\pi(p)$ equal to either $g(0)$ or $g(T)$, only the directional derivatives of π are defined. We denote by $d\pi_p : T_p\mathcal{X} \to T_pg$, the (directional) derivative of π at p. The main result of this section is the following uniform (strict) contraction property of WP geodesic segments in certain regions of the Teichmüller space.

Theorem 5.1. *Given $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, $\bar{\epsilon}, T$ and b positive, there is a $\delta \in [0,1)$ with the following property. Let σ be a possibly empty multi-curve such that the subsurface $S\backslash\sigma$ is a large subsurface. Let $g : [0,T] \to U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\sigma)$ be a geodesic segment and let $\mathcal{N}_b(g([0,T]))$ be the $b-$neighborhood of $g([0,T])$. Then we have that $\frac{||d\pi_p(v)||^2}{||v||^2} \leq \delta$, for every $p \in \mathrm{Teich}(S)\backslash\mathcal{N}_b(g([0,T]))$ and $v \in T_p\,\mathrm{Teich}(S)$.*

Remark 5.2. Compare this theorem with the contraction property of Teichmüller geodesics which project to the thick part of the moduli space (co-bounded geodesics) proved by Minsky in [Min96]. Minsky uses the explicit description of flat surfaces along a Teichmüller geodesic. However we use various estimates on the WP metric and its derivatives and a standard Jacobi field argument.

We start by collecting some of Wolpert's estimates for the Weil-Petersson metric and WP Levi-Civita covariant derivatives in the thin part of the Teichmüller space.

On a Riemannian manifold the Levi-Civita covariant derivative ∇ (see e.g. [Cha06, §I.5]) is the unique covariant derivative which is

- compatible with the Riemannian metric, i.e. for any smooth path $\zeta(t)$ and vector fields V and W along ζ, $\frac{d}{dt}\langle V,W\rangle = \langle \nabla_{\dot{\zeta}}V, W\rangle + \langle V, \nabla_{\dot{\zeta}}W\rangle$, and
- torsion free, i.e. for any two vector fields V and W, $\nabla_V W - \nabla_W V = [V,W]$. Here $[.,.]$ denotes the Lie bracket of vector fields.

Given a multi-curve σ and $c_0 > 0$. Let $\{\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha, \mathrm{grad}\,\ell_\beta\}_{\alpha\in\sigma,\beta\in\varsigma}$ be the *short and relative length frame field* in the region

$$U_{c_0}(\sigma) = \{x \in \mathrm{Teich}(S) : \ell_\alpha(x) \leq c_0 \text{ for every } \alpha \in \sigma\}$$

introduced by Wolpert in [Wol08]. Here ς is a marking on the surface $S\backslash\sigma$. $\lambda_\alpha = \mathrm{grad}\,\ell_\alpha^{1/2}$ and $\mathrm{grad}\,\ell_\beta$ are vector fields. J is the almost complex structure of the Teichmüller space. Recall $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ the completion stratum corresponding to pinching the curves in the multi-curve σ from §2.2.

Proposition 5.3. *$\langle \lambda_\alpha, \lambda_{\alpha'} \rangle = O(\ell_\alpha^{3/2} \ell_{\alpha'}^{3/2})$ for every $\alpha, \alpha' \in \sigma$ such that $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. $\langle \lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_{\alpha'} \rangle = 0$ for every $\alpha, \alpha' \in \sigma$. $||\lambda_\alpha||^2 = \Theta(1)$ for every $\alpha \in \sigma$. $\langle \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta, \lambda_\alpha \rangle = O(\ell_\alpha^{3/2})$ for every $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \varsigma$. $\langle \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta, J\lambda_\alpha \rangle = 0$ for every $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \varsigma$. For every $\beta, \beta' \in \varsigma$, $\langle \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta, \operatorname{grad} \ell_{\beta'} \rangle$ is continuous in a neighborhood of the $\sigma-$stratum $\mathcal{S}(\sigma) \subset \overline{\operatorname{Teich}(S)}$. Here the constant of the O notation and the constants of the Θ notation are uniform for $\ell_\alpha \leq c_0$.*

The estimates of the above proposition are established in Lemmas 3.12 and 4.2 of [Wol08]. See also Theorem 4.3 and Corollaries 4.3 and 4.4 of [Wol08] where Wolpert puts these estimates together to get expansions for the WP metric near completion strata. The WP metric is the real part of a Hermitian metric on the Teichmüller space. So $\langle V, W \rangle = \langle JV, JW \rangle$, where J is the almost complex structure of the Teichmüller space with the property that $J^2 = -I$. Thus estimates for the rest of pairings of the vector fields of the short and relative length frame field follow from the ones listed in the above proposition.

Proposition 5.4. *(*[Wol09, Theorem 3.4]*)* $\nabla_V \lambda_\alpha = 3\ell_\alpha^{-1/2} \langle J\lambda_\alpha, V \rangle J\lambda_\alpha + O(\ell_\alpha^{3/2})$ *where the constant of the O notation is uniform for $\ell_\alpha \leq c_0$.*

Proposition 5.5. $\nabla_{\lambda_\alpha} \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta = O(\ell_\alpha^{1/2})$, $\nabla_{J\lambda_\alpha} \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta = O(\ell_\alpha^{1/2})$. *Moreover $\nabla_{\operatorname{grad} \ell_{\beta'}} \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta$ is continuous in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma) \subset \overline{\operatorname{Teich}(S)}$. Here the constant of the O notation is uniform for $\ell_\alpha \leq c_0$.*

The estimates of the above proposition are from Proposition 4.6 of [Wol09]. We also need the following estimates for the WP sectional curvatures. Let V, U be two vector fields. The sectional curvature is defined by

$$\kappa(U, V) = \frac{\langle R(U, V)V, U \rangle}{|U \wedge V|^2},$$

where $|U \wedge V|^2 = ||U||^2 ||V||^2 - \langle U, V \rangle^2$.

Proposition 5.6. *(*[Wol12, Theorem 21]*) Let σ be a multi-curve and P be a pants decomposition, so that $\sigma \subseteq P$. The diagonal curvature evaluations for $\alpha \in \sigma$ satisfy $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha) J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha \rangle = 3(16\pi\ell_\alpha^3)^{-1} + O(\ell_\alpha)$ and all of the remaining curvature evaluations are continuous in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma) \subset \overline{\operatorname{Teich}(S)}$.*

In the above proposition evaluations of the Riemann curvature tensor are in the frame $\{\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in P}$ (not the short and relative length frame). Wolpert uses the convention that on $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ the following evaluations of the Riemann curvature tensor $\langle R((J)\lambda_\alpha, (J)\lambda_\beta)(J)\lambda_\gamma, (J)\lambda_\delta \rangle$ vanish:

- $\alpha \in \sigma$ and at least one of β, γ and δ is distinct from α,
- $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in P - \sigma$ and not all of them on the same component of a Riemann surface with nodes represented in $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$.

Define the bundles $N_\sigma = \text{span}\{\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\sigma}$ and $P_\sigma = \text{span}\{\text{grad}_\beta\}_{\beta\in\varsigma}$ over $U_{c_0}(\sigma)$. Any vector field V on the Teichmüller space has a decomposition as $V = V_N + V_P$, where V_N is a section of N_σ and V_P is a section of P_σ.

We prove two lemmas which elaborate the asymptotic product form of the WP metric.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\epsilon \leq c_0$. Let $p \in U_\epsilon(\sigma)$ and $v, w \in T_p\,\text{Teich}(S)$ be two vectors with $||v||^2 \leq 1$ and $||w||^2 \leq 1$. Let*

$$v = \textstyle\sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} a_\alpha\lambda_\alpha + b_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta \,\text{grad}\,\ell_\beta.$$

Then

(i) For any $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \varsigma$ the coefficients a_α, b_α and c_β are $O(1)$.
(ii) Suppose that $v \in P_\sigma$ and $w \in N_\sigma$. Then $\langle v, w\rangle|_p \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.
(iii) $||v||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||v_N||^2$ and $||v||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||v_P||^2$.

Proof. Denote by $\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}$ the closure of $U_\epsilon(\sigma)$ in $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$. The short and relative length frame field $\{\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha, \text{grad}\,\ell_\beta\}_{\alpha\in\sigma,\beta\in\varsigma}$ on the region $U_\epsilon(\sigma)$ extends to a frame field on $\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}$. Moreover the frame field is invariant under the action of the mapping class group. So projects to a frame field

$$\mathbb{F} := \{E_i, E'_i, F_j\}_{i=1,\dots,|\sigma|,j=1,\dots,|\varsigma|}$$

on $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$. Since the WP metric is also invariant under the action of the mapping class group the inner product of any two vectors in the frame is preserved. Thus by the estimates of Proposition 5.3 we have: $||E_i||^2 = \Theta(1)$, $||E'_i||^2 = \Theta(1)$, $\langle E_i, E'_{i'}\rangle = 0$ if $i \neq i'$, $\langle E_i, F_j\rangle = O(\epsilon^{3/2})$, $\langle F_j, E'_i\rangle = 0$ and $\langle F_j, F_{j'}\rangle = \Theta(1)$. Note that the constant of the O notation and the constants of the Θ notation depend only on c_0.

Denote by $\hat{p}$ the projection of the point p to $\mathcal{M}(S)$. For any frame at $T_{\hat{p}}\mathcal{M}(S)$, the square of the lengths of the vectors of the frame and the inner product of any two of them together determine a point in $\mathbb{R}^{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|} \times \mathbb{R}^{\binom{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|}{2}}$, and vice versa. So the set of frames at $\hat{p}$ are parametrized by $\mathbb{R}^{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|} \times \mathbb{R}^{\binom{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|}{2}}$. The bounds above determine a compact subset $K(\hat{p}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|} \times \mathbb{R}^{\binom{2|\sigma|+|\varsigma|}{2}}$. Moreover the frame $\mathbb{F}$ at $\hat{p}$ is in $K(\hat{p})$. Denote the projection of $\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}$ to $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$ by $\widehat{\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}}$ which is a compact subset of $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$. So the frame field $\mathbb{F}$ is in a compact subset of the extension of the frame bundle of the moduli space to the completion of the moduli space.

Denote the unit ball tangent bundle of the moduli space by $BT\mathcal{M}(S)$. The short and relative length frame field provides a bundle extension for the tangent bundle of Teich(S) and $\mathcal{M}(S)$ to their WP completions (see [Wol08]). Denote the extension of $BT\mathcal{M}(S)$ by $BT\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$. The vector v projects to a vector in $\widehat{BT\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}}$. Note that each of the functions a_α, b_α and c_β, where $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \varsigma$ descends to a function on the compact set

$\widehat{K(\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)})} \times B\widehat{TU_\epsilon(\sigma)}$. Therefore, each one of these functions is bounded on $\overline{U_\epsilon(\sigma)}$. Part (i) is proved.

Since $v \in P_\sigma$, $v = \sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} a_\alpha\lambda_\alpha + b_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha$. Moreover since $w \in N_\sigma$, $w = \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c'_\beta \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta$. Expanding $\langle v, w\rangle$ we get

$$\langle v, w\rangle = \sum_{\alpha\in\sigma,\beta\in\varsigma} a_\alpha c'_\beta\langle\lambda_\alpha, \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta\rangle + b_\alpha c'_\beta\langle J\lambda_\alpha, \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta\rangle.$$

By part (i) all of the coefficients in the sum above are $O(1)$. Moreover by Proposition 5.3 all of the pairings in the sum above are $O(\epsilon)$. So each term in the sum above goes to 0 as $\epsilon \to 0$. Part (ii) is established.

We have that

$$||v||^2 = ||v_N||^2 + ||v_P||^2 + 2\langle v_N, v_P\rangle. \tag{5.1}$$

The vectors $\frac{v_P}{||v_P||} \in P_\sigma$ and $\frac{v_N}{||v_N||} \in N_\sigma$, moreover $||\frac{v_P}{||v_P||}||^2 = 1$ and $||\frac{v_N}{||v_N||}||^2 = 1$. Then by part (ii) for ϵ sufficiently small, $\langle\frac{v_N}{||v_N||}, \frac{v_P}{||v_P||}\rangle \leq \frac{1}{4}$. If $||v_N||^2 \geq ||v_P||^2$, then

$$|\langle v_N, v_P\rangle| \leq \frac{1}{4}||v_N||||v_P|| \leq \frac{1}{4}||v_N||^2.$$

Replacing the above inequality into (5.1) and dropping the non-negative term $||v_P||^2$ on the right-hand side, we get

$$||v||^2 \geq ||v_N||^2 - \frac{1}{2}||v_N||^2 = \frac{1}{2}||v_N||^2.$$

If $||v_P||^2 \geq ||v_N||^2$, by the exact same argument we get $||v||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||v_P||^2$, which again implies that $||v||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||v_N||^2$. This finishes the proof of part (iii). □

Lemma 5.8. *Given a multi-curve σ and $T > 0$. Let $\zeta : [0, T] \to U_\epsilon(\sigma)$ be a WP geodesic segment parametrized by arc length. Let*

$$\dot\zeta = \textstyle\sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} a_\alpha\lambda_\alpha + b_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta.$$

Then for every $\alpha \in \sigma$ we have that $a_\alpha \to 0$ and $b_\alpha \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. We show that for any $\alpha \in \sigma$ we have that $a_\alpha \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. The proof of $b_\alpha \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ is similar.

Set the constant

$$\Lambda = \min\{||\lambda_\alpha(x)||^2 : x \in c_0\text{−thin part of the Teichmüller space and } \alpha \in \mathcal{C}_0(S)\}.$$

Note that by the estimate for $||\lambda_\alpha||^2$ in Proposition 5.3, $\Lambda > 0$. In contrary assume that there is a sequence $\epsilon_n \to 0$, a sequence of WP geodesic segments parametrized by arc-length $\zeta_n : [0, T] \to U_{\epsilon_n}(\sigma)$, and a sequence of times $t_n \in [0, T]$ so that for some $u > 0$,

$$a_n \geq \frac{3u}{\Lambda}.$$

After applying elements of the mapping class group (remarking), we may assume that the geodesic segments ζ_n are in a compact region of the completion of the Teichmüller space. Then by the estimates in Proposition 5.3 for any $\alpha, \alpha' \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in \varsigma$, $\langle \lambda_\alpha, \lambda_{\alpha'} \rangle = O(\epsilon_n^3)$ $(\alpha \neq \alpha')$, $\langle \lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_{\alpha'} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \lambda_\alpha, \operatorname{grad} \ell_\beta \rangle = O(\epsilon^{3/2})$, so we have

$$||\lambda_\alpha||^2 a_n = \langle \lambda_\alpha, \dot{\zeta}_n(t_n) \rangle + O(\epsilon_n^{3/2}).$$

Thus for all n sufficiently large

$$\langle \dot{\zeta}_n(t_n), \lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 \geq 2u. \tag{5.2}$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define the function

$$F_n(t) = \langle \dot{\zeta}_n(t), \lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 + \langle \dot{\zeta}_n(t), J\lambda_\alpha \rangle^2.$$

By the formula at the end of §5.2 of [Wol11], $\frac{dF_n}{dt} = O(\ell_\alpha^{3/2})$ where the constant of the O notation depends only on an upper bound for ℓ_α. For all n sufficiently large $\zeta_n([0,T]) \subset U_{\epsilon_n}(\sigma)$, so $\ell_\alpha(\zeta(t)) \leq \epsilon_n$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover $\epsilon_n \to 0$. Then for any n large enough

$$\Big| \frac{dF_n}{dt} \Big| \leq \frac{u}{2T}.$$

Let $t \in [0,T]$. Using the Fundamental theorem of calculus and the above inequality we get $|F_n(t) - F_n(t_n)| \leq \frac{u}{2}$. By (5.2), $F_n(t_n) \geq 2u$. Thus we may conclude that

$$F_n(t) \geq \frac{3u}{2} \tag{5.3}$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$.

The formula from Proposition 5.4 for the WP covariant derivative and a straightforward calculation using properties of the Levi-Civita covariant derivative gives us

$$\ddot{\ell}_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) = 2\langle \dot{\zeta}_n(t), \lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 + 6\langle \dot{\zeta}_n(t), J\lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 + O(\epsilon_n^{3/2}).$$

Moreover,

$$2\langle \dot{\zeta}_n, \lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 + 6\langle \dot{\zeta}_n, J\lambda_\alpha \rangle^2 \geq 2F_n(t).$$

By (5.3) for all n sufficiently large $2F_n(t) \geq 3u$. Thus for n large enough we have

$$\ddot{\ell}_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) \geq u \tag{5.4}$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$.

We claim that

$$\max_{t \in [0,T]} \ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) \geq \frac{1}{16} u T^2. \tag{5.5}$$

Let $t_{\min,n} \in [0,T]$ be such that $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_{\min,n})) = \min_{t \in [0,T]} \ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t))$. If there is a $t \in [0,T]$ such that $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) - \ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_{\min,n})) \geq \frac{1}{16} u T^2$, then since $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_{\min,n})) \geq 0$ we get the desired lower bound in (5.5). Otherwise, $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) - \ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_{\min,n})) < \frac{1}{16} u T^2$ for every $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover, $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) \geq$

0 for every $t \in [0,T]$. Either the interval $[0, t_{\min,n}]$ or $[t_{\min,n}, T]$ has length greater than or equal $\frac{T}{2}$. Then the Mean-value Theorem for the interval with length at least $\frac{T}{2}$ implies that there is $t_n^* \in [0,T]$ such that $|\dot{\ell}_\alpha(t_n^*)| < \frac{uT}{8}$. Let $t \in [0,T]$. Integrating (5.4) from t_n^* to t and using the bound $|\dot{\ell}_\alpha(t_n^*)| < \frac{uT}{8}$ we have

$$\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) - \ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_n^*)) \geq \frac{1}{2}u(t-t_n^*)^2 - \frac{uT}{8}(t-t_n^*).$$

Let $t_n' \in [0,T]$ be such that $|t_n' - t_n^*| = \frac{T}{2}$. At t_n', the right-hand side of the above inequality is either $\frac{uT^2}{16}$ or $\frac{3uT^2}{16}$. Then since $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_n^*)) \geq 0$ from the above inequality we get $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t_n')) \geq \frac{uT^2}{16}$. So we again have the lower bound (5.5). The proof of the claim is complete.

The lower bound (5.5) for all n sufficiently large contradicts the fact that $\zeta_n([0,T])$, by the assumption that $\epsilon_n \to 0$, is a sequence of geodesic segments converging to the $\sigma-$stratum where the $\alpha-$length-function is identically 0. This contradiction implies that $a_\alpha \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. □

Corollary 5.9. *Let $\epsilon \leq c_0$. Let ζ be a WP geodesic segment in $U_\epsilon(\sigma)$. Then for ϵ sufficiently small, $\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\zeta}_P||^2 \leq ||\dot{\zeta}||^2 \leq ||\dot{\zeta}_P||^2$.*

Proof. We have $||\dot{\zeta}||^2 = ||\dot{\zeta}_P||^2 + ||\dot{\zeta}_N||^2 + 2\langle \dot{\zeta}_P, \dot{\zeta}_N\rangle$. Let

$$\dot{\zeta} = \textstyle\sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} a_\alpha \lambda_\alpha + b_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta,$$

then

$$||\dot{\zeta}_N||^2 = \textstyle\sum_{\alpha,\alpha'\in\sigma} a_\alpha a_{\alpha'}\langle\lambda_\alpha,\lambda_{\alpha'}\rangle + 2a_\alpha b_{\alpha'}\langle\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_{\alpha'}\rangle + b_\alpha b_{\alpha'}\langle J\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_{\alpha'}\rangle.$$

By Proposition 5.3 all of the inner products in the above sum are either 0, $O(1)$ or $O(\epsilon^3)$ where the constants of the O notations depend only on c_0. Moreover by Lemma 5.8, a_α and b_α go to 0 as $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus $||\dot{\zeta}_N||^2 \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Furthermore, by Lemma 5.7(ii), $\langle \dot{\zeta}_P, \dot{\zeta}_N\rangle \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. So for ϵ sufficiently small $\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\zeta}_P||^2 \leq ||\dot{\zeta}||^2$. The inequality $||\dot{\zeta}||^2 \leq ||\dot{\zeta}_P||^2$ is part (iii) of Lemma 5.7. □

Let ζ be a smooth path and V be a vector field along ζ, we denote $\nabla_{\dot{\zeta}}V$ by V' and $\nabla_{\dot{\zeta}}\nabla_{\dot{\zeta}}V$ by V''. The following lemma shows that the bundle N_σ is almost parallel near the $\sigma-$stratum.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\epsilon \leq c_0$. Given a multi-curve σ and $v > 0$. Let $\zeta : [0,T] \to U_\epsilon(\sigma)$ be a smooth curve and V a vector field along ζ with $||V||^2 \leq v$. Then $||(V')_N - (V_N)'|| \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, and therefore $\big|||(V')_N|| - ||(V_N)'||\big| \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.*

Proof. Let $V = \sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} a_\alpha\lambda_\alpha + b_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta$ and $\dot\zeta = \sum_{\alpha\in\sigma} d_\alpha\lambda_\alpha + e_\alpha J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} f_\beta \operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta$. Expanding V'_N and $(V_N)'$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}(V')_N - (V_N)' &= (\sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta\nabla_{\dot\zeta}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta + \dot c_\beta\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta)_N = (\sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_\beta\nabla_{\dot\zeta}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta)_N\\ &= \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma,\alpha\in\sigma}\big(c_\beta d_\alpha\nabla_{\lambda_\alpha}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta + c_\beta e_\alpha\nabla_{J\lambda_\alpha}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta\big)_N\\ &+ \sum_{\beta,\beta'\in\varsigma}\big(c_\beta f_{\beta'}\nabla_{\operatorname{grad}\ell_{\beta'}}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta\big)_N\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.5, $c_\beta d_\alpha\nabla_{\lambda_\alpha}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta = c_\beta d_\alpha O(\ell_\alpha^{1/2})$ and $c_\beta e_\alpha\nabla_{J\lambda_\alpha}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta = c_\beta e_\alpha O(\ell_\alpha^{1/2})$. So each one of the terms in the first sum after the last equality above goes to 0 as $\epsilon\to 0$. The vector fields $\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta$ and $\operatorname{grad}\ell_{\beta'}$ are tangent to the stratum $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ so is $\nabla_{\operatorname{grad}\ell_{\beta'}}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta$. Therefore, by the continuity of the covariant derivatives as stated in Proposition 5.5 $(c_\beta f_{\beta'}\nabla_{\operatorname{grad}\ell_{\beta'}}\operatorname{grad}\ell_\beta)_N \to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$. So we may conclude that all of the terms after the last equality above go to 0 as $\epsilon\to 0$. So $||(V')_N - (V_N)'||\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$. Furthermore, $\big|||(V')_N|| - ||(V_N)'|||\big| \le ||(V')_N - (V_N)'||$, hence $\big|||(V')_N|| - ||(V_N)'|||\big|\to 0$ as $\epsilon\to 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We start by some results in the general setting of a geodesically convex, negatively curved Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{X}$. Let $p\in\mathcal{X}$ and $\pi(p)$ be the nearest point to p on $g([0,T])$. Let $\zeta:[0,s_1]\to\mathcal{X}$ be the geodesic segment parametrized by arclength with $\zeta(0)=\pi(p)$ and $\zeta(s_1)=p$. We have the following two situations:

(A) $\pi(p)$ is in the interior of $g([0,T])$ or is an end point of $g([0,T])$ and is the nearest point to p on a slightly longer geodesic segment containing $g([0,T])$ in its interior.
(B) $\pi(p)$ is one of the end points $g(0)$ or $g(T)$ and is not the nearest point to p on any geodesic segment containing $g([0,T])$ in its interior.

Suppose that (B) holds: We show that there is an open ball centered at p which is mapped by the nearest point projection to one of the end points. For otherwise, there is a sequence of points $p_n\to p$ so that $\pi(p_n)$ is the nearest point to p_n on a slightly longer geodesic segment containing $g([0,T])$. But then continuity of the projection when points are projected to the interior of a geodesic segment (see (1) at the beginning of §4) implies that $\pi(p)$ is the nearest point to p on a slightly longer geodesic segment containing $g([0,T])$. This contradicts the assumption (B).

Now the existence of a ball centered at p which is mapped by the nearest point projection to one of the end points implies that $d\pi_p = 0$. Thus $\frac{||d\pi_p(v)||^2}{||v||^2} < \delta$ for any $\delta\in[0,1)$.

The rest of the proof is devoted to show that $\frac{||d\pi_p(v)||^2}{||v||^2} < \delta$ for some $\delta\in[0,1)$ assuming (A). First we reformulate the bound in terms of Jacobi

fields along the geodesic segments ζ connecting a point p to its nearest point $\pi(p)$ on g. This reformulation will be convenient to work with. A vector field $J(s) := J(\zeta(s))$ along $\zeta(s)$ is a Jacobi field if it satisfies the Jacobi equation

$$J'' + R(J, \dot{\zeta})\dot{\zeta} = 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Here $R(.,.).$ denotes the Riemann curvature operator. $\dot{\zeta}$ denotes the derivative of ζ with respect to s. $J' = \nabla_{\dot{\zeta}} J$ and $J'' = \nabla_{\dot{\zeta}} \nabla_{\dot{\zeta}} J$.

Let us first characterize the map $d\pi : T\mathcal{X} \to Tg$ in terms of Jacobi fields. Given $v \in T_p\mathcal{X}$, let $\eta : [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \to \mathcal{X}$ be a smooth path passing through p with $\eta(0) = p$ and $\dot{\eta}(0) = v$. Then the family of geodesics connecting each point $\eta(t)$ to $\pi(\eta(t))$ the nearest point to $\eta(t)$ on g defines a variation of geodesics

$$u : \{(t, s) : t \in [-\epsilon, +\epsilon], s \in [0, s_1]\} \to \mathcal{X},$$

where for each t, $u(t, s)$ is the geodesic connecting $\eta(t)$ to $\pi(\eta(t))$. Denote $u(0, s) = \zeta(s)$ where $s \in [0, s_1]$ be the geodesic connecting p to $\pi(p)$. The vector field $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ is a Jacobi field. Denote $J(s) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{(0,s)}$ for every $s \in [0, s_1]$, where $J(s_1) = v$ and $J(0) = d\pi(v)$.

Lemma 5.11. *Let J be a Jacobi field as above, we have*

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2|_{s=0} = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. A straightforward calculation shows that $\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2|_{s=0} = 2\langle J'(0), J(0)\rangle$. So we need to verify that $\langle J(0), J'(0)\rangle = 0$. Note that $\dot{\zeta}(s) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}|_{(0,s)}$ and $J(s) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{(0,s)}$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle J(0), J'(0)\rangle &= \langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}\rangle|_{s=0} = \langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} \\
&= -\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} = -\langle \nabla_{f\dot{g}} f\dot{g}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} \\
&= -\langle f\dot{g}(f)\dot{g}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows because ∇ is torsion free and $[\frac{\partial u}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}] = 0$. By the compatibility of the Levi-Civita covariant derivative and the Riemannian metric we have: $\frac{d}{dt}\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle = \langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle + \langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle$. Since $\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} = 0$ for every t, $\frac{d}{dt}\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle = 0$. So we have the third equality. In the fourth equality we replace $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{s=0}$ by $f\dot{g}$, where $f : [-\epsilon, +\epsilon] \to \mathbb{R}$. The fifth equality follows from a straightforward calculation using the fact that for the geodesic g, $\nabla_{\dot{g}}\dot{g} = 0$. The last equality holds because $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}|_{s=0} = f\dot{g}$ and $\langle \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}, \frac{\partial u}{\partial s}\rangle|_{s=0} = 0$ for all t. □

Using the Jacobi equation (5.6) for any $s \in [0, s_1]$ we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{ds^2}||J||^2 = ||J'||^2 - \kappa(s)|\dot{\zeta} \wedge J|^2 \tag{5.8}$$

where $\kappa(s) = \kappa(\dot{\zeta}(s), J(s))$ is the sectional curvature of the span of $\dot{\zeta}(s)$ and $J(s)$ and $|\dot{\zeta} \wedge J|^2 = ||J||^2||\dot{\zeta}||^2 - \langle J, \dot{\zeta}\rangle^2$.

Lemma 5.12. *Given a Jacobi field J we have*

(i) $\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 \geq 0$ *for every* $s \in [0, s_1]$.
(ii) $||J(s)||^2$ *is non-decreasing on the interval* $[0, s_1]$.
(iii) $\langle J(s), \dot{\zeta}(s)\rangle$ *is a linear function.*

Proof. By (5.8) and the fact that $\kappa \leq 0$ we have $\frac{d^2}{ds^2}||J||^2 \geq 0$. Thus $\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2$ is non-decreasing. Furthermore, by (5.7), $\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2|_{s=0} = 0$. Thus $\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2 \geq 0$. Part (i) is proved. Part (ii) follows from part (i). We proceed to prove part (iii). A straightforward calculation using the Jacobi equation (5.6) gives us

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}\langle J, \dot{\zeta}\rangle = \langle R(J, \dot{\zeta})\dot{\zeta}, \dot{\zeta}\rangle = 0.$$

This implies that $\langle J(s), \dot{\zeta}(s)\rangle$ is linear, because its second derivative is identically 0. Part (iii) is proved. □

Given $b \geq 0$. Denote the closed $b-$neighborhood of $g([0,T]) \subset \mathcal{X}$ by $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$. Denote the boundary of $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ by $\partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is negatively curved the nearest point projection map $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ is 1-Lipschitz. This follows from the growth of the norm of Jacobi fields given in the proof of part (IV) of Theorem 4.1. Furthermore, the projection of a point $p \in \mathcal{X}$ to $g([0,T])$ may be obtained by first projecting p on $\partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ and then projecting this point to $g([0,T])$. So we only need to prove the strict contraction of the nearest point projection map for the points of $\partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$.

Now we return to the setting of the Teichmüller space equipped with the WP metric. Recall that $g([0,T]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\sigma)$. Let $p \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ and let ζ be the geodesic segment connecting p to $\pi(p)$. Given a unit vector $v \in T_p\mathcal{X}$ ($||v||^2 = 1$) as we saw earlier there is a Jacobi field J along ζ with $J(b) = v$ and $J(0) = d\pi(v)$. Then $\frac{||d\pi_p(v)||^2}{||v||^2} = ||J(0)||^2$. It follows from Lemma 5.13 (see below) that there is $\delta > 0$ so that $\frac{||d\pi_p(v)||^2}{||v||^2} \leq \delta < 1$. This would complete the proof of the theorem. □

Lemma 5.13. *Given $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$, there is $\hat{b} = \hat{b}(\bar{\epsilon}) > 0$ so that for any $b \in [0, \hat{b})$ and any $b' \in [0, b)$, there is a constant $\delta = \delta(\bar{\epsilon}, b, b')$ with the following property. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small. Let σ be a multi-curve so that $S\backslash\sigma$ is a large subsurface. Let $g([0,T]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\sigma)$ be a geodesic segment. Let $p \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ and suppose that $\pi(p)$ the nearest point to p on $g([0,T])$ be as in (A) in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $v \in T_p\mathcal{X}$ and let ζ be a geodesic connecting p to $\pi(p)$. Moreover let J be a Jacobi field we set up in the proof of Theorem 5.1. Then*

$$||J(b')||^2 \leq \delta. \tag{5.9}$$

Moreover δ decreases as $b' \to 0$.

Proof. First we explain our strategy to prove the bound (5.9): Suppose that a neighborhood of a stratum $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\sigma})$ is foliated with totally geodesic leaves with negative sectional curvatures bounded away from 0. Suppose that the geodesic ζ connecting p to $\pi(p)$ and J are tangent to the leaves of the foliation over an interval E. Then $\kappa(J, \dot{\zeta})$ is negative over E and we obtain a negative upper bound for the first term on the right-hand side of (5.8). If not, J varies over E so that we may obtain a lower bound for $||J'||$ and the second term on the right-hand side of (5.8). Having these bounds integrating both sides of the equation (5.8) we obtain an upper bound for $||J(b')||^2$.

We do not have quite this picture, however a modification of the above argument gives us the bound as is outlined in the following. There is $\epsilon' > 0$ so that for any u there exist interval E and a multi-curve $\hat{\sigma} \subset \sigma$ of definite length such that $\zeta(t) \in U_{u,\epsilon'}(\hat{\sigma})$ (Claim 5.15). Recall the decomposition of the tangent bundle of the Teichmüller space $T\,\mathrm{Teich}(S) = P_{\hat{\sigma}} + N_{\hat{\sigma}}$. If the $P_{\hat{\sigma}}$ component of $J(s)$ has a definite length over E, then using compactness arguments we establish a negative upper bound for the sectional curvature of the span of $\dot{\zeta}(s)$ and $J(s)$ over a subinterval of E. This provides a negative upper bound for the second term on the right-hand side of (5.8). Note that the sectional curvatures are bounded away from 0 in the thick part of the $\hat{\sigma}-$stratum ($\hat{\sigma}$ is a non-separating multi-curve) and $P_{\hat{\sigma}}$ is almost tangent to the level manifolds of the functions $(\ell_\alpha^{1/2})_{\alpha\in\hat{\sigma}}$ which define a foliation in a neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\sigma})$. If the $P_{\hat{\sigma}}$ component of $J(s)$ does not have a definite length over E then since $J(0) \in P_{\hat{\sigma},\zeta(0)}$ (the normal component of $J(0)$ is 0) the normal component of J varies over E which gives rise to a lower bound for the integral of $||(J_N)'||$ on a subinterval of E. Furthermore, by Lemma 5.10 the bundle $N_{\hat{\sigma}}$ is almost parallel, so we may obtain a lower bound for the integral of $||J'||^2$. This provides a lower bound for $||J'||^2$ and consequently the first term on the right-hand side of (5.8). Having these bounds integrating both sides of the equation (5.8) we get the desired bound for $||J(b')||^2$. We proceed to implement this strategy.

The following two claims provide us a thick-thin decomposition for a portion of the geodesic segment ζ of definite length.

Claim 5.14. For any $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$, there are $h, \epsilon' > 0$ with the following properties. Suppose that ζ is a geodesic segment in the h neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. Then $\ell_\beta(\zeta(t)) > \epsilon'$ for any $\beta \notin \sigma$.

Passing to the quotient and using the fact that there are finitely many disjoint strata in the completion of the moduli space $\overline{\mathcal{M}(S)}$, there is a lower bound for the distance of $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\sigma)}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\tau)}$ for any two multi-curves σ and τ with $\sigma \pitchfork \tau$. Moreover the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of the $\sigma-$stratum is compact and does not contain any point in $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\sigma)}\backslash\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. So there is a lower bound for the distance of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of the $\sigma-$stratum and any point in a $\tau-$stratum, where $\sigma \subsetneq \tau$. Therefore, there is a lower bound for the distance of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ and any $\tau-$stratum with $\tau \pitchfork \sigma$ or

$\sigma \subsetneq \tau$ only depending on $\bar{\epsilon}$. This means that there is $h > 0$ such that the $h-$neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ only intersects the strata of multi-curves $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$. Now suppose that ζ is in the h neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. Then by compactness argument there is a lower bound $\epsilon' > \epsilon$ for the length of every curve $\beta \notin \sigma$ along ζ. The claim is proved.

In the rest of proof suppose that $b \leq \frac{h}{2}$.

Claim 5.15. There is an $e > 0$ with the following properties. Let $\zeta : [0, b] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be the geodesic segment connecting a point $p \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ to the nearest point to p on $g([0,T])$. For any $u < \epsilon'$, there is a multi-curve $\hat{\sigma} \subseteq \sigma$ (possibly empty) and an interval $E \subseteq [0, b]$ with $|E| = e$ such that $\zeta(t) \in U_u(\hat{\sigma})$ for any $t \in E$.

Since $g([0,T]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\sigma)$, $g([0,T])$ converges into the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. Thus for ϵ sufficiently small $g([0,T])$ is contained in the $\frac{h}{2}$ neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_h(g([0,T]))$ is geodesically convex, and the points $\zeta(0), \zeta(b) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}_h(g([0,T]))$. So $\zeta([0,b]) \subset \overline{\mathcal{N}}_h(g([0,T]))$ and therefore $\zeta([0,b])$ is in the h neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$.

Given $t \in [0,b]$, let σ_t be the maximal subset of σ (possibly empty) such that $\ell_\alpha(\zeta(t)) < u$ for any $\alpha \in \sigma_t$. Since $\zeta([0,b])$ is in the h neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ by Claim 5.14 we have: For any $\alpha \notin \sigma$, $\ell_\alpha(\zeta(t)) > \epsilon'$. Then since $u \leq \epsilon'$ we may conclude that $\sigma_t \subseteq \sigma$.

By the convexity of length-functions along WP geodesics (Theorem 2.6) for any $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$, the set of $t \in [0,b]$ such that $\sigma_t = \sigma'$ is an interval. The number of multi-curves $\sigma' \subseteq \sigma$ is $2^{|\sigma|} \leq 2^{\xi(S)}$ where $\xi(S) = 3g - 3 + n$. By these two observations there is a possibly empty multi-curve $\hat{\sigma} \subseteq \sigma$ and an interval E of length at least $e = \frac{b}{2^{\xi(S)}}$ such that $\sigma_t = \hat{\sigma}$ for every $t \in E$. Note that e only depends on b and $\bar{\epsilon}$. The proof of the claim is complete.

Any vector in $T_p\mathcal{X}$ has a decomposition to a component tangent to ζ and a component orthogonal to ζ. We are in the situation that $\langle \dot{\zeta}, \dot{g} \rangle|_{\pi(p)} = 0$ and $d\pi_p : T_p\mathcal{X} \to T_{\pi(p)}g$ is a linear map (see (A)). The linear map $d\pi$ maps any vector tangent to ζ to $0 \in T_{\pi(p)}g$. Thus by the linearity of $d\pi$ we only need to prove (5.9) for vectors v with $\langle v, \dot{\zeta}(b) \rangle = 0$. Let v be such a vector, and suppose that $||v||^2 = 1$. Let J be a Jacobi field with $J(0) = d\pi(v)$ and $J(b) = v$. Then since $\langle \dot{\zeta}(b), J(b) \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \dot{\zeta}(0), J(0) \rangle = 0$, by Lemma 5.12(ii), for every $s \in [0,b]$ we have

$$\langle J(s), \dot{\zeta}(s) \rangle = 0. \tag{5.10}$$

Let $s \in [0,b]$. By Lemma 5.12(i), $||J(s)||^2$ is a non decreasing function in s. Then since $||J(b)||^2 = 1$ we have $||J(s)||^2 \leq 1$. Let $\omega_0 < 1$ be a constant which does not depend on p and will be determined. If $||J(0)||^2 \leq \omega_0$, since $||J(b)||^2 = 1$, the bound (5.9) immediately holds. So in the rest of the proof we will assume that $||J(0)||^2 \geq \omega_0$. Then using the fact that $||J(s)||^2$ is non-decreasing we have $||J(s)||^2 \geq \omega_0$. We record the upper and lower bounds

for $||J(s)||^2$,

$$\omega_0 \leq ||J(s)||^2 \leq 1. \tag{5.11}$$

The geodesic $g([0,T]) \subset U_\epsilon(\sigma)$, so by Corollary 5.9, $||\dot{g}_P||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||\dot{g}||^2$. Then since $J(0) = ||J(0)||\dot{g}$, by (5.11), $||J_P(0)||^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{2}$.

For u sufficiently small, let E be the interval from Claim 5.15. We will consider the following two cases depending on the behavior of the function $||J_P(s)||^2$ on E.

Case 1:

$$||J_P(s)||^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{4} \tag{5.12}$$

for every $s \in E$.

Claim 5.16. There is a closed subinterval $E' \subseteq E$ and $k_0 < 0$ such that for every $s \in E'$ we have $\kappa(\dot{\zeta}(s), J(s)) \leq k_0$.

The proof of the claim is by contradiction. In contrary suppose that there exist a sequence of points $p_n \in \partial\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$ and geodesic segments $\zeta_n : [0,b] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ connecting p_n to the nearest point to p_n on $g([0,T])$, and intervals $E_n \subseteq [0,b]$ as in Claim 5.15, so that for any sequence of subinterval $I_n \subseteq E_n$ there are times $s_n \in I_n$ such that

$$\kappa(\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n), J_n(s_n)) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$, where J_n is a Jacobi field along the geodesic segment ζ_n satisfying (5.10), (5.11) and (5.12).

Note that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|E_n| \geq \frac{b}{2^{\xi(S)}}$. So after trimming the intervals E_n and reparametrization of the geodesic segments $\zeta_n|_{E_n}$ we may assume that $E_n \equiv E$.

Claim 5.17. There exist $u' > 0$, a sequence $u_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, a possibly empty multi-curve $\hat{\tau} \subseteq \hat{\sigma}$ anda closed subinterval $E' \subseteq E$ so that $\zeta_n(t) \in U_{u_n,u'}(\hat{\tau})$ for any $t \in E'$.

The proof is by contradiction. Apply Theorem 2.4 to the geodesic segments ζ_n and let the partition $t_0 < .... < t_{k+1}$, multi-curves σ_i, $i = 0, ..., k+1$, $\hat{\tau}$ and the piece-wise geodesic $\hat{\zeta}$ be as the theorem. Let $0 \leq j \leq k$ and let E' be a closed subinterval of (t_j, t_{j+1}). Then

- there is $u'' > 0$ so that for any $t \in E'$ and any $\alpha \in \hat{\sigma} - \hat{\tau}$, $\ell_\alpha(\hat{\zeta}(t)) > 2u''$,
- for any $\alpha \in \hat{\tau}$ and any $t \in E'$, $\ell_\alpha(\hat{\zeta}(t)) = 0$.

Let the elements of mapping class group ψ_n be as in Theorem 2.4. The geodesic segments ζ_n are in $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$, which is a compact subset of $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$. This implies that that $\psi_n \equiv I$. Moreover by Claim 5.15, $\ell_\alpha(\zeta(t)) > \epsilon'$ for any $\alpha \notin \hat{\sigma}$, so for each $i = 1, ..., k$, $\sigma_i \subseteq \hat{\sigma}$. Similarly $\hat{\tau} \subseteq \hat{\sigma}$. For $i = 1, ..., k$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{T}_{i,n}$ and $\varphi_{i,n}$ be as in Theorem 2.4. Then each

$\mathcal{T}_{i,n} \in \mathrm{tw}(\hat{\sigma})$. Thus each $\varphi_{i,n}$ is the composition of I and powers of positive Dehn twists about curves in $\hat{\sigma}$. So applying each $\varphi_{i,n}$ to a point in the Teichmüller space does not change the isotopy class and length of any curve $\alpha \in \hat{\sigma}$. Let $E' \subset (t_j, t_{j+1})$ be as above, by Theorem 2.4(3), for any $t \in E'$, $\varphi_{j,n}(\zeta_n(t)) \to \hat{\zeta}(t)$ as $n \to \infty$. Then since $\varphi_{j,n}$ does not change the length and isotopy class of curves in $\hat{\sigma}$, it follows from the two bullets above, respectively, and the continuity of length-functions that

- $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) > u''$ for any $\alpha \in \hat{\tau}$ and $t \in E'$,
- there is a sequence $u_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, so that $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) < u_n$ for any $\alpha \in \hat{\tau}$ and $t \in E'$.

Also since $E' \subseteq E$, as we said before, by Claim 5.15, $\ell_\alpha(\zeta_n(t)) < \epsilon'$, for any $\alpha \notin \hat{\sigma}$, and $t \in E'$.

Thus the claim holds for the interval $E' \subseteq E$, the multi-curve $\hat{\tau}$, the constant $u' = \min\{\epsilon', u''\}$, and the sequence u_n.

The geodesic segments $\zeta_n(E')$ are in $\overline{\mathcal{N}}_b(g([0,T]))$, which is a compact subset of $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$. Then by Claim 5.17 after possibly passing to a subsequence $\zeta_n(E')$ converge to the $u'-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau})$.

First suppose that $\hat{\tau} \neq \emptyset$. Let $s_n \in E'$ and $\zeta_n(s_n)$ converge to p as $n \to \infty$. The vectors $\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n)$ converge to a vector $v \in T_p\,\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ with $||v||^2 = 1$ and $J_n(s_n)$ converge to a vector $w \in T_p\,\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ with $||w||^2 \geq \omega_0$. Moreover, $\langle v, w\rangle = 0$. So $\mathrm{span}(v, w)$ is a nondegenerate plane at p in the $u'-$thick part of the Teichmüller space. There is an upper bound $k_1 < 0$ for the sectional curvatures in this region. Thus for n sufficiently large, $\kappa(\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n), J_n(s_n)) < \frac{k_1}{2} < 0$. Since $s_n \in E'$ was arbitrary, the sequence of intervals E' provides a contradiction to the assumption that for any sequence of subintervals $I_n \subseteq E$, there are times $s_n \in I_n$ so that $\kappa(\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n), J_n(s_n)) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

Remark 5.18. The upper bound for the sectional curvatures follows from the fact that the Weil-Petersson metric is defined on the moduli space and the thick part of the moduli space is compact.

In the rest of the proof of the claim we assume that $\hat{\tau} \neq \emptyset$. Since $\hat{\tau}$ is a non-separating multi-curve, $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau})$ is not product of lower complexity strata. Then all of the sectional curvatures of the stratum $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau})$ are bounded above by some $k_2 < 0$ in the $u'-$thick part of the stratum.

Let $s_n \in E'$ and $\zeta_n(s_n)$ converge to p as $n \to \infty$. In what follows for simplicity we often drop reference to the point $\zeta_n(s_n)$. For example, we write λ_α instead of $\lambda_\alpha(\zeta(s_n))$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n) &= \sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\sigma}} a_{\alpha,n}\lambda_\alpha + b_{\alpha,n}J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} c_{\beta,n}\,\mathrm{grad}\,\ell_\beta, \text{ and}\\
J_n(s_n) &= \sum_{\alpha\in\hat{\sigma}} d_{\alpha,n}\lambda_\alpha + e_{\alpha,n}J\lambda_\alpha + \sum_{\beta\in\varsigma} f_{\beta,n}\,\mathrm{grad}\,\ell_\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\zeta_n(s_n) \in U_{u_n}(\hat{\tau})$ and $||\dot{\zeta}_n||^2 = 1$, by Lemma 5.7(i) the coefficients $a_{\alpha,n}$, $b_{\alpha,n}$ and $c_{\beta,n}$ are $O(1)$. Similarly, since $||J_n||^2 \leq 1$, the coefficients $d_{\alpha,n}, e_{\alpha,n}$ and $f_{\beta,n}$ are $O(1)$. Where the constant of O notations depend only on an upper bound for u' and u_n's.

We have the following bounds for the terms in the expansion of $\langle R(\dot{\zeta}_n, J_n)J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n\rangle$. For any $\alpha \in \hat{\tau}$

- The four terms $a^2_{\alpha,n}e^2_{\alpha,n}\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle$, $b^2_{\alpha,n}d^2_{\alpha,n}\langle R(J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\rangle$, $a_{\alpha,n}e_{\alpha,n}d_{\alpha,n}b_{\alpha,n}\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\rangle$ and $a_{\alpha,n}e_{\alpha,n}d_{\alpha,n}b_{\alpha,n}\langle R(J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle$ add up to a non-positive number for all n sufficiently large.
- Any term which is a multiple of $\langle R((J)\lambda_\alpha, .)., .\rangle$ except the ones in the first bullet is either 0 or has arbitrary small absolute value for all n sufficiently large.

The first bullet: For each n, $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle$ is evaluated at the point $\zeta_n(s_n)$ which converges to the point p in the $u'-$thick part of $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau})$. Then by the limit of the diagonal terms in Proposition 5.6, $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$. By symmetries of the Riemann curvature tensor (see e.g. [Cha06, §II.1]):

$$\begin{aligned} R(J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\rangle &= \langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle, \text{ and} \\ \langle R(J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle &= \langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\rangle = -\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Then the four terms in the first bullet add up to

$$(a_{\alpha,n}e_{\alpha,n} - b_{\alpha,n}d_{\alpha,n})^2 R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle,$$

which since $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle \to -\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, is non-positive for all n sufficiently large.

The second bullet: By symmetries of the Riemann curvature tensor any evaluation of Riemann curvature tensor with at three or four λ_α or $J\lambda_\alpha$ vanishes. For example $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle = 0$. So the terms which are multiple of them also vanish. The only evaluation of the Riemann curvature tensor with two λ_α and $J\lambda_\alpha$ which are not in the first bullet are $\langle R(J\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha)\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha\rangle$ and $\langle R(\lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\alpha)J\lambda_\alpha, J\lambda_\alpha\rangle$ which are 0. So their multiples also vanish. The rest of terms by the bounds on the coefficients we established above and the convergence statement in Proposition 5.6 (see the paragraph after the proposition about the convention for the evaluations of the curvature tensor) converge to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Thus these terms have arbitrary small absolute value.

Now using the symmetries of the Riemann curvature tensor and the bounds in the above two bullets, each term of the expansion of $\langle R(\dot{\zeta}_n, J_n)J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n\rangle$ with one component λ_α or $J\lambda_\alpha$ ($\alpha \in \hat{\tau}$) is either non-positive or has arbitrary small absolute value when n is sufficiently large. The rest of the terms in the expansion of $\langle R(\dot{\zeta}_n, J_n)J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n\rangle$ add up to $\langle R((\dot{\zeta_n})_P, (J_n)_P)(J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P\rangle$. We proceed to show that there is $k_0 < 0$ so that

$$\langle R((\dot{\zeta_n})_P, (J_n)_P)(J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P\rangle \leq k_0$$

for all n sufficiently large.

We have $||J_n||^2 \leq 1$, so by Lemma 5.7(iii), $||(J_n)_P||^2 \leq 2$. Then $2 \geq ||(J_n)_P||^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{4}$, so after possibly passing to a subsequence $(J_n)_P$ converge to a nonzero vector v with $2 \geq ||v||^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{4}$.

By Corollary 5.9, for n sufficiently large $1 \leq ||(\dot{\zeta}_n)_P||^2 \leq 2$. So $(\dot{\zeta}_n)_P$ converge to a nonzero vector w with $1 \leq ||w||^2 \leq 2$.

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (J_n)_N, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_N \rangle + \langle (J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_N \rangle + \langle (J_n)_N, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle + \langle (J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle &= \langle J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle \\ (5.13) \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad \qquad &\equiv 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\zeta_n(E') \subset U_{u_n}(\hat{\tau})$ and $u_n \to 0$, by Lemma 5.8, $a_{\alpha,n} \to 0$ and $b_{\alpha,n} \to 0$, therefore $||(\dot{\zeta}_n)_N||^2 \to 0$. Furthermore, since $||J_n||^2 \leq 1$, by Lemma 5.7(iii) for all n sufficiently large, $||(J_n)_N||^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $||(J_n)_P||^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. So by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, the first term and the second term of the sum in (5.13) go to 0 as $n \to \infty$. $||J_n||^2 \leq 1$, so by Lemma 5.7(iii) $||(J_n)_P||^2 \leq 2$ and $||(J_n)_N||^2 \leq 2$. Then by Lemma 5.7(ii) the third term of the sum in (5.13) goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Having these bounds, from (5.13) we may conclude that $\langle (J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Therefore $\langle v, w \rangle = 0$.

The evaluation of the Riemann curvature tensor $\langle R((\dot{\zeta}_n)_P, (J_n)_P)(J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle$ limits to $\langle R(v,w)w, v \rangle$ as $n \to \infty$. The vectors v and w are based at the point p in the $u'-$thick part of the $\hat{\tau}-$stratum where all of the sectional curvatures of the stratum are bounded above by some $k_2 < 0$. As we saw above $||v||^2 \leq 2$, $||w||^2 \leq 2$ and $\langle v, w \rangle = 0$, so $|v \wedge w|^2 = ||v||^2||w||^2 - \langle v, w \rangle^2 \leq 4$. Then

$$\langle R(v,w)w, v \rangle = \kappa(v,w)|v \wedge w|^2 \leq 4k_2.$$

Therefore,

$$\langle R((\dot{\zeta}_n)_P, (J_n)_P)(J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle \leq k_3$$

where $k_3 = 3k_2 < 0$ for all n sufficiently large.

Putting together the above estimates, for all n sufficiently large, $\langle R(\dot{\zeta}_n, J_n)J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle$ is the sum of terms which are either negative or has arbitrary small absolute value and the term $\langle R((\dot{\zeta}_n)_P, (J_n)_P)(J_n)_P, (\dot{\zeta}_n)_P \rangle \leq k_3 < 0$. Thus for all n sufficiently large, $\langle R(\dot{\zeta}_n, J_n)J_n, \dot{\zeta}_n \rangle \leq \frac{k_3}{2}$. Moreover, $||\dot{\zeta}_n||^2 \equiv 1$, $||J_n||^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{2}$ and $\langle \dot{\zeta}_n, J_n \rangle \equiv 0$, so $|\dot{\zeta}_n \wedge J_n|^2 \geq \frac{\omega_0}{2}$. Thus $\kappa(\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n), J_n(s_n)) \leq \frac{k_3}{\omega_0} < 0$. Since $s_n \in E'$ was arbitrary, the intervals E' provides a contradiction to the assumption that for any sequence of intervals $I_n \subseteq E$, there are times $s_n \in I_n$ such that $\kappa(\dot{\zeta}_n(s_n), J_n(s_n)) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

The proof of Claim 5.16 is complete.

Remark 5.19. An explicit upper bound in terms of the systole of the Riemann surface representing the point in the Teichmüller space where the curvature tensor and sectional curvatures are evaluated is not available (see the introduction of [Wol12]). So we need to deduce the bounds on sectional curvatures using compactness arguments as above.

Let the interval $E' = [c, d]$ and $k_0 < 0$ be from Claim 5.16. Let $s \in [c, d]$. Then by the claim

$$\kappa(s) = \kappa(\dot{\zeta}(s), J(s)) \leq k_0.$$

Moreover, $[c, d] \subset [0, b]$, so by (5.10), $\langle J(s), \dot{\zeta}(s)\rangle = 0$, and by (5.11), $||J(s)||^2 \geq \omega_0$. Thus we have

$$|J \wedge \dot{\zeta}|^2 = ||J||^2||\dot{\zeta}||^2 - \langle J, \dot{\zeta}\rangle \geq \omega_0.$$

Using the above two inequalities,

$$-\kappa(s)|J \wedge \dot{\zeta}|^2 \geq -k_0\omega_0 > 0. \tag{5.14}$$

By (5.8),

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{ds^2}||J(s)||^2 = ||J'(s)||^2 - \kappa(s)|J(s) \wedge \dot{\zeta}(s)|^2,$$

then by the inequality (5.14) we have

$$\frac{d^2}{ds^2}||J(s)||^2 \geq -2k_0\omega_0 > 0.$$

Suppose that $b' \leq |E'|$, then $b' \leq d$. Integrating the above inequality over the interval $[b', s]$ $(s > b')$ we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 - \frac{d}{ds}||J(b')||^2 \geq -2k_0\omega_0(s - b'),$$

Moreover, by Lemma 5.12(iii), $\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 \geq 0$. So we get

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 \geq -2k_0\omega_0(s - b').$$

Now integrating the above inequality from b' to d we get

$$||J(d)||^2 \geq ||J(b')||^2 - k_0\omega_0(s - b')^2\big|_{b'}^{d} = ||J(b')||^2 - k_0\omega_0(d - b')^2.$$

By Lemma 5.12(i), $||J||^2$ is non-decreasing, so $||J(b)|| \geq ||J(d)||$ and $||J(b')|| \geq ||J(0)||$. Then from the above inequality we deduce that

$$1 = ||J(b)||^2 \geq ||J(0)||^2 - 2k_0\omega_0(b - b')^2.$$

Consequently, for $\delta = 1 + k_0\omega_0(b - b')^2$, (5.9) holds. Here to guarantee that $1 + k_0\omega_0|E'|^2 > 0$, we need to set $\omega_0 > \frac{-1}{k_0|E'|^2}$. Furthermore, note that since $k_0 < 0$, $\delta < 1$ and decreases as $b' \to 0$.

Case 2: $||J_P(s)||^2 \leq \frac{\omega_0}{4}$ for some $s \in E$.

Let

$$s_0 = \min\{s : s \in E \text{ and } ||J_P(s)||^2 \leq \frac{\omega_0}{4}\}.$$

Note that since $||J_P(0)||^2 \geq \omega_0$ and $||J_P(s)||^2$ is continuous in s we have $s_0 > 0$.

Claim 5.20. There is $\Phi > 0$ depending only on ω_0 and b such that

$$\int_0^s ||J'||^2 ds > \Phi$$

for every $s \geq s_0$.

By (5.11), $||J(s_0)||^2 \geq \omega_0$. By the set up of s_0, $||J_P(s_0)||^2 \leq \frac{\omega_0}{4}$. By (5.11), $||J(s_0)||^2 \leq 1$. Then by Lemma 5.7(iii), $||J_N(s_0)||^2 \leq 2$ and $||J_P(s_0)||^2 \leq 2$. Thus by Lemma 5.7(ii), $\langle J_N(s_0), J_P(s_0)\rangle \to 0$ as $u \to 0$. Thus given $q > 0$, for ϵ sufficiently small we have $|\langle J_N(s_0), J_P(s_0)\rangle| \leq q$.

We have $||J(s_0)||^2 = ||J_N(s_0)||^2 + ||J_P(s_0)||^2 + 2\langle J_N(s_0), J_P(s_0)\rangle$. Then using the bounds we mentioned above we get

$$||J_N(s_0)||^2 \geq \frac{3\omega_0}{4} - q. \tag{5.15}$$

It follows from the way we constructe the Jacobi field J that $J(0) = ||J(0)||\dot{g}|_{\pi(p)}$. Moreover, $g([0,T]) \subset U_\epsilon(\sigma)$. Furthermore, by (5.11), $||J(0)||^2 \leq 1$. So by Lemma 5.8 given $q > 0$ for ϵ sufficiently small, $||J_N(0)||^2 \leq q$.

Now we have:

(5.16)

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\omega_0}{2} &\leq \int_0^{s_0} \frac{d}{ds}||J_N||^2 ds \leq \int_0^{s_0} 2|\langle J_N, J_N'\rangle| ds \\ &\leq 2\Big(\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N'||^2 ds\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N||^2 ds\Big)^{1/2} \leq 2\Big(\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N'||^2 ds\Big)^{1/2}\sqrt{2b}\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the Fundamental theorem of calculus and the bounds $||J_N(s_0)||^2 \geq \frac{3\omega_0}{4} - q$ and $||J_N(0)||^2 \leq q$ we got above. Here $q = \frac{\omega_0}{8}$ and u and ϵ are sufficiently small. The second inequality follows from the compatibility of the Riemannian metric and its Levi-Civita covariant derivative. The third inequality is the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. For the last inequality note that by (5.11), for any $s \in [0,b]$, $||J(s)||^2 \leq 1$. Then Lemma 5.7(iii) implies that for u sufficiently small $||J_N(s)||^2 \leq 2$. Furthermore, $s_0 \leq b$. Thus $\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N||^2 ds \leq 2b$. Giving us the last inequality.

From the bound (5.16) we get

$$\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N'||^2 ds \geq \frac{\omega_0^2}{32b}. \tag{5.17}$$

By Lemma 5.7(iii), we have that $||J'||^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}||(J')_N||^2$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{s_0} ||J'||^2 ds &\geq \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{s_0} ||(J')_N||^2 ds \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\Big(\int_0^{s_0} ||J_N'||^2 ds - \int_0^{s_0} ||J_N'||^2 - ||(J')_N||^2 ds\Big). \qquad (5.18)\end{aligned}$$

By (5.11), $||J||^2 \leq 1$ along ζ. Then by Lemma 5.10 we have that

$$\big|||J_N'||^2 - ||(J')_N||^2\big| \to 0,$$

as $u \to 0$. So the last integral of (5.18) goes to 0 as $u \to 0$. Thus by (5.17) from (5.18) we may deduce that for u sufficiently small,

$$\int_0^{s_0} ||J'||^2 ds \geq \frac{\omega_0^2}{56b}.$$

Let $\Phi := \frac{\omega_0^2}{65b}$. Now $||J'||^2 \geq 0$, so for every $s \geq s_0$ we have

$$\int_0^s ||J'||^2 ds \geq \int_0^{s_0} ||J'||^2 ds \geq \Phi.$$

This finishes the proof of our claim.

The negative curvature of the WP metric and (5.8) imply that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d^2}{ds^2}||J(s)||^2 \geq ||J'(s)||^2.$$

Integrating the above inequality on the interval $[0, s]$, we get

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 - \frac{d}{ds}||J||^2|_{s=0} \geq 2\int_0^s ||J'||^2 ds.$$

By (5.7), $\frac{d}{ds}||J||^2|_{s=0} = 0$, so by the above inequality we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 \geq 2\int_0^s ||J'||^2 ds.$$

By Claim 5.20 for every $s \geq s_0$, $\int_0^s ||J'||^2 ds \geq \Phi$, therefore

$$\frac{d}{ds}||J(s)||^2 \geq 2\Phi.$$

Suppose that $b' \leq s_0$. Then integrating the above inequality on the interval $[b', b]$ we get

$$||J(b)||^2 \geq ||J(b')||^2 + 2\Phi(b - b').$$

We have $||J(b)||^2 = 1$, so

$$1 \geq ||J(b')||^2 + 2\Phi(b - b').$$

Consequently, for $\delta = 1 - 2\Phi(b - b')$, (5.9) holds. Note that since $\omega_0 < 1$ we have $\Phi < \frac{1}{33b}$ and then $\delta > 0$. Furthermore, note that $\delta < 1$ and decreases as $b' \to 0$.

Let $\hat{b} = \min\{|E'|, s_0\}$, where $|E'|$ is the length of the interval E' we set in Case 1 and s_0 is the constant we set in Case 2. Let δ be the maximum of the δ's we worked out in Cases 1 and 2. Then for $b' \leq \hat{b}$, (5.9) holds. Note that δ only depends on b', b, $\bar{\epsilon}$, k_0 and ω_0. Moreover, the choice of $|E'|$, ω_0, s_0 and k_0 depend only on $\bar{\epsilon}$ (coming from compactness arguments). So $\hat{b}$ depends only on $\bar{\epsilon}$, and δ depends on only on b', b, $\bar{\epsilon}$. Furthermore as we saw in both cases $\delta < 1$ and decreases as $b' \to 0$. □

6. Strongly asymptotic rays

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. Throughout this section ν^+ is a lamination as in §2.3 and (ν^-, ν^+) is a narrow pair, where ν^- is a marking. Our strategy to prove the theorem is the same as the one for the proof of the Recurrent Ending Lamination Theorem (Theorem 1.2) in [BMM10, §4]. Let $r_{\nu^\pm}$ be a WP geodesic ray with prescribed itinerary with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients (see Theorem 3.1). For simplicity denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. Suppose that r' is a geodesic ray which is not strongly

asymptotic to r and its ending lamination is contained in ν^+. In Narrow Visibility Theorem (Theorem 6.5) we show that there is a bi-infinite geodesic g strongly asymptotic to the ray r in the forward time and asymptotic to r' in the backward time, i.e. r is visible. Moreover any measured lamination with bounded length along both r and r' has bounded length along g. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ending measured lamination of r'. By Lemma 2.9 $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along r'. Now the forward ending lamination of r' is ν^+. So the support of $\mathcal{L}$ is a sublamination of ν^+. Then Proposition 6.6 implies that $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along r too. Consequently $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g in both the forward and the backward time. But this violates the convexity of the length of measured laminations along WP geodesics (Theorem 2.6). Thus we may conclude that the rays r and r' are strongly asymptotic. In other words, the forward ending lamination determines the strong asymptotic class of rays with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients.

Definition 6.1. Two geodesic rays $r, r' : [0, \infty) \to \mathcal{X}$ parametrized by arc-length in a metric space are asymptotic if there are d and T positive such that for every $t \geq T$, $d(r(t), r'(t)) \leq d$. The rays r and r' are strongly asymptotic if for some $a \geq 0$, $d(r(t + a), r'(t)) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$.

Theorem 6.2. (Asymptotic $\Longrightarrow$ strongly asymptotic)
Let $r_{\nu^\pm}$ be a WP geodesic ray with prescribed itinerary with $A-$narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients. Then any WP geodesic ray r' asymptotic to $r_{\nu^\pm}$ is also strongly asymptotic to $r_{\nu^\pm}$.

Proof. For simplicity of notation we denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. Assume that r and r' are parametrized by arc-length.

By Lemma 3.6 given $A, d > 0$ and $\epsilon \leq \bar{\epsilon}$ ($\bar{\epsilon}$ is the constant in Lemma 3.6) for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a time interval $[t_k^-, t_k^+]$ of length at least d and a large subsurface Z_k such that $r([t_k^-, t_k^+]) \subseteq U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z_k)$. Moreover, $t_k^+ < t_{k+1}^-$.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the geodesic segments $[r(0), r'(n)]$ and $r([0, n])$ and let $U_{1,n} : \triangle_{1,n} \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be the geodesic variation described in §4. Similarly for the geodesic segments $[r(n), r'(n)]$ and $r([0, n])$ let $U_{2,n} : \triangle_{2,n} \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be the geodesic variation described in §4. Let $\triangle_n = \triangle_{1,n} \cup \triangle_{2,n}$ and $U_n : \triangle_n \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be the map which restricts to $U_{1,n}$ on $\triangle_{1,n}$ and restricts to $U_{2,n}$ on $\triangle_{2,n}$ (see Figure 2).

Let $f_n : [0, T_n] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be a parametrization of the geodesic segment $[r(0), r'(n)]$ by arclength. Let $V_{k,n} \subseteq [0, T_n]$ be a subinterval so that for any $t \in V_{k,n}$, $\pi(f_n(t)) \in r([t_k^-, t_k^+])$. Let $\lambda_n(t)$ be the length of $[f_n(t), \pi(f_n(t))]$. Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b > 0$ be so that $b \leq \lambda_n(t)$ for every $t \in V_{k,n}$. Let $W_{k,n} \equiv [0, b]$. Let

$$u_{k,n} := U_n|_{V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n}} : V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n} \to \text{Teich}(S).$$

We denote $V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n}$ with the pull back metric by $u_{k,n}$ by $\square_{k,n}$, and call b the height of $\square_{k,n}$. Recall m the measure introduced after Theorem 4.1 in §4. Let $l_{b,k,n}$ be the length of $u_{k,n}(V_{k,n} \times b)$. By Theorem 4.1(IV) the length of $l_{k,n,s}$ is increasing in s and is greater that length$(V_{k,n} \times 0)$. Then since



FIGURE 2. $U_n : \triangle_n \to \text{Teich}(S)$ is a variation of geodesics. The bold intervals are $r([t_k^-, t_k^+]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z_k)$. $f_n : [0, T_n] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ is a parametrization of $[r(0), r'(n)]$. For k, n, $V_{k,n}$ is an interval so that for any $t \in V_{k,n}$, the nearest point to $f_n(t)$ is on $r([t_k^-, t_k^+])$. Moreover, $W_{k,n} \equiv [0, b]$. The rectangular regions are $U_n(V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n})$.

each $[t_k^-, t_k^+]$ has length at least d, we may choose the interval $V_{k,n}$ so that $l_{k,n,b} = u_{k,n}(V_{k,n} \times b) \equiv d$ for k, n as above.

Claim 6.3. There is $K_0 > 0$ depending on b and d, so that for k, n as above

$$\int \int_{\square_{k,n}} -\kappa dA + \int_{V_{k,n}} m \geq K_0.$$

Remark 6.4. In [BMM10, §4] the recurrence to the thick part of the moduli space where all of the sectional curvatures are bounded above by a negative constant is used to produce regions with the above property.

For every $b' \in (0, b]$ consider the Jacobi field

$$J_{b',k,n} = \frac{\partial u_{k,n}}{\partial t}\Big|_{u_{k,n}(t,b')},$$

which is tangent to the path $u_{k,n}(., b')$. For each $t \in V_{k,n}$ consider the geodesic $u_{k,n}(t, .)$. Let $\hat{b}$ and δ be as in Lemma 5.13 for geodesic segments $u_{k,n}(t, .)$. Note that since $V_{k,n}$ is a compact interval we may choose $\hat{b} > 0$ uniform over $V_{k,n}$. Also given b' we may choose δ uniform over $V_{k,n}$. Then by the lemma

$$||J_{b',k,n}||^2 \leq \delta ||J_{b,k,n}||^2.$$

Moreover by Lemma 5.13, δ decreases as $b' \to 0$, so we may choose δ uniform for all b'. Integrating both sides of the above inequality over the interval $V_{k,n}$ and taking square root we get

$$l_{b',k,n} \leq \sqrt{\delta} l_{b,k,n}.$$

Now as we defined before Lemma 4.4, let $l_{0,k,n} = \lim_{s\to 0} l_{s,k,n}$. Then taking limit as $b' \to 0$ of both sides of the above inequality we obtain $\sqrt{\delta} l_{b,k,n} \geq l_{0,k,n}$. Subtracting both sides of this inequality from $l_{b,k,n}$ we get

$$l_{b,k,n} - l_{0,k,n} \geq l_{b,k,n} - \sqrt{\delta} l_{b,k,n}.$$

Then since $l_{b,k,n} \equiv d$ for k, n, we have

$$l_{b,k,n} - l_{0,k,n} \geq (1 - \sqrt{\delta})d.$$

Then Lemma 4.4 guarantees that the claim holds for $K_0 = \frac{(1-\sqrt{\delta})d}{b}$.

We proceed to finish the proof of the theorem by contradiction. Suppose that the geodesic rays r and r' are not strongly asymptotic. Then since the distance function in a CAT(0) space is a convex function, there are $b_0 > 0$ and $T > 0$ such that

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(r(t), r'(t)) > b_0$$

for all $t \geq T$. Let $b = \frac{b_0}{2}$. Let N_n be the number of ruled rectangles $\square_{k,n} \subset \triangle_n$ with hight b. Then by Claim 6.3 we have

$$N_n K_0 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} (\int\int_{\square_{k,n}} -\kappa dA + \int_{V_{k,n}} m).$$

Moreover $\bigcup_k \square_{k,n} \subset \triangle_n$ and $-\kappa$ is a positive function and m a positive measure so we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N_n} (\int\int_{\square_{k,n}} -\kappa dA + \int_{V_{k,n}} m) \leq \int\int_{\triangle_n} -\kappa dA + \int_{[0,n]} m.$$

By the formula (4.5) the right-hand side is bounded above by π independent of n. Thus $N_n \leq \frac{\pi}{K_0}$ for all n. On he other hand, the CAT(0) comparison for $\triangle_n$ shows that N_n would be made arbitrary large by increasing n. This contradicts the upper bound for N_n we just obtained. The fact that r and r' are strongly asymptotic follows from this contradiction. The proof of the theorem is complete. □

Theorem 6.5. (Narrow Visibility)

Let $r_{\nu^\pm}$ be a WP geodesic ray with prescribed itinerary with narrow end invariant and bounded annular coefficients. Let r' be a WP geodesic ray which is not strongly asymptotic to r. Then there is a bi-infinite geodesic in $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$ which is strongly asymptotic to $r_{\nu^\pm}$ in the forward time and asymptotic to r' in the backward time. In other words, $r_{\nu^\pm}$ is visible.

We know that the restriction of ν^+ to a large subsurface Y is in $\mathcal{EL}(Y)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{ML}(Y)$ has bounded length along both $r_{\nu^\pm}$ and r'. Then $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g.

Proof. For simplicity we denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. Let r and r' both be parametrized by arc-length. We may omit finitely many of intervals $[t_k^-, t_k^+]$ and assume that there is $b_0 > 0$ such that for each k the distance of the geodesic segment

$r([t_k^-, t_k^+])$ and r' is at least b_0. The reason is that in a CAT(0) space the distance between any two geodesic rays is a convex function, so the distance of r and r' is a monotonic function after some time. Then since the rays r and r' are not strongly asymptotic the distance function is bounded below.

We briefly recall the set up from Theorem 6.2. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the geodesic segments $[r(0), r'(n)]$ and $r([0,n])$, and the geodesic segments $r([0,n])$ and $[r(n), r'(n)]$. Let $U_n : \triangle_n \to \mathcal{X}$ be the map defined by putting together the geodesic variations. Let $f_n : [0, T_n] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be a parametrization of $[r(0), r'(n)]$ by arclength. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let $V_{k,n} \subseteq [0, T_n]$ be such that for any $t \in V_{k,n}$, $\pi(f_n(t)) \in r([t_k^-, t_k^+])$. Suppose that there is a $b > 0$ so that $b \leq \lambda_n(t)$ for all $t \in V_{k,n}$. Then let $W_{k,n} \subset [0, b]$. We may assume that the length of each interval $V_{k,n}$, $|V_{k,n}| \equiv d$. Let

$$u_{k,n} := U_n|_{V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n}} : V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n} \to \text{Teich}(S).$$

We denote $V_{k,n} \times W_{k,n}$ with the pull back metric by $u_{k,n}$ by $\square_{k,n}$. Let $g_n : [a_n, b_n] \to \text{Teich}(S)$ be a parametrization by arc-length of $[r(n), r'(n)]$.

First we show that after possibly passing to a subsequence there are parameters $\hat{t}_n \in [a_n, b_n]$ so that the points $g_n(\hat{t}_n)$ converge to a point $z \in \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$.

Let $T > 0$ be such that $d(r(t), r'(t)) > b_0$ for every $t > T$. Let $b = \frac{b_0}{2}$. We claim that there is $\hat{k}$ such that $u_{\hat{k},n}(\square_{\hat{k},n}) \cap g_n \neq \emptyset$ for all sufficiently large n.

Let $K_0 > 0$ be the constant in Claim 6.3 in the proof of Theorem 6.2. Let $\hat{k} \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $g_n \cap u_{\hat{k},n}(\square_{\hat{k},n}) = \emptyset$. Let N_n be the number of $\square_{k,n} \subset \triangle_n$ with hight b. Then the fact that $\bigcup_k \square_{k,n} \subset \square_n$ and Claim 6.3 as we saw in the proof of Theorem 6.2 give us

$$N_n K_0 \leq \int \int_{\triangle_n} -\kappa dA + \int_{[T,n]} m.$$

By the formula (4.5) the right-hand side is bounded above by π independent of n. Thus $N_n \leq \frac{\pi}{K_0}$ for all n sufficiently large. On the other hand, by the CAT(0) comparison for $\triangle_n$, N_n can be made arbitrary large by increasing n. We may also assume that $n > \hat{k}$. So for $\hat{k}$ sufficiently large we get a contradiction to the upper bound we just got and the claim follows.

As we saw above there is an integer $\hat{k}$ so that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, the geodesic segment g_n and $\square_{\hat{k},n}$ intersect. Let the point $z_n \in \square_{\hat{k},n}$ and the parameter $\hat{t}_n$ be so that $z_n = g_n(\hat{t}_n)$. Then all of the points z_n are in the $b-$neighborhood of $r([t_{\hat{k}}^-, t_{\hat{k}}^+])$ which is a compact subset of $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$. Therefore after possibly passing to a subsequence we may assume that the points z_n converge to a point z in the $b-$neighborhood of $r([t_{\hat{k}}^-, t_{\hat{k}}^+])$.

Now we proceed to show that the geodesic segments g_n converge to a geodesic g passing through z. We reparametrize g_n by arc-length such that $g_n(0) = z_n$. Let $t \in [0, \infty)$. Let the integer $N_t \geq 1$ be such that $d(z, r(n)) > t$ for each integer $n \geq N_t$. We show that the sequence $\{g_n(t)\}_{n=N_t}^{\infty}$ is a

Cauchy sequence. To see this, let h_n^+ be the geodesic segment joining z to $r(n)$ parametrized by arc-length. As is shown in Lemma 8.3 in [BH99, §II.8] $\{h_n^+(t)\}_{n=N_t}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Furthermore, let $g_n^+ = g_n|_{[0,b_n]}$, for each $n \geq N_t$ by the CAT(0) comparison for the triangle with vertices z, z_n and $r(n)$, $d(h_n^+(t), g_n^+(t)) < d(z_n, z)$. Then since $z_n \to z$ we have that $\{g_n(t)\}_{n=N_t}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Let $t \in (-\infty, 0]$. Let the integer $N_t \geq 1$ be such that $d(z, r(n)) > -t$ for each integer $n \geq N_t$. A similar argument shows that the sequence $\{g_n(t)\}_{n=N_t}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence. Therefore for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ the sequence $g_n(t)$ is convergent in $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$. The point-wise limit of a sequence of parametrized geodesics in a complete CAT(0) space is a parametrized geodesic. Moreover the convergence is as parametrized geodesics. Thus the sequence of geodesics g_n converges to a bi-infinite geodesic $g : \mathbb{R} \to \overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$ as parametrized geodesics. See the proof of Proposition 8.2 in [BH99, §II.8] for more detail. The geodesic g is the limit of the geodesic segments $[r(n), r'(n)]$, so $g^+ = g|_{[0,\infty)}$ is asymptotic to r and $g^- = g|_{[0,-\infty)}$ is asymptotic to r'. Moreover, by Theorem 6.2, g^+ is strongly asymptotic to r. The first assertion of the theorem is proved.

We continue by proving the second assertion of the theorem. Suppose that $Y = S$. In the above discussion we may choose b small enough so that the closure of the $b-$neighborhood of the $\bar{\epsilon}-$thick part of the Teichmüller space does not intersect any completion stratum. Each point z_n is in the thick part of the Teichmüller space, and therefore $z \in \text{Teich}(S)$. Thus the measured lamination $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length at z. By the assumption of the theorem $\mathcal{L}$ has uniformly bounded length at the points $r(n)$. So by Theorem 2.6 (Convexity of length-functions) $\mathcal{L}$ has uniformly bounded length along the geodesic segments $[z, r(n)]$. Then by continuity of length-functions $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g^+. A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g^-. Therefore $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g

Now suppose that Y is a proper subsurface. Let ρ be a hierarchy path between the narrow pair ν^- and ν^+. There is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$, so that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\partial Y \subset \rho(i + N)$ (see [MM00, §5]). Then Theorem 3.1 guarantees that for any k sufficiently large, $r([t_k^-, t_k^+]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z)$ for some subsurface Z with $\partial Y \subseteq \partial Z$. In the discussion above we may choose b small enough so that the $b-$neighborhood of $U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z)$ only intersects $\sigma-$strata where $\sigma \subseteq \partial Z$. Then choosing $\hat{k}$ large enough each z_n is in the $b-$neighborhood of $r([t_{\hat{k}}^-, t_{\hat{k}}^+]) \subset U_{\epsilon,\bar{\epsilon}}(\partial Z)$ for some subsurface Z with $\partial Y \subseteq \partial Z$. Thus z the limit of the points z_n after possibly passing to a subsequence is a point in a $\sigma-$stratum where $\sigma \subseteq \partial Z$ (note that σ could be empty). Then the non-refraction property of completion strata (Theorem 5.2 in [Wol10, Chapter 5]) guarantees that $g \subset \mathcal{S}(\sigma)$.

We claim that $\sigma \subseteq \partial Y$. To see this, note that the geodesic segments $[r(n), r'(n)]$ after possibly passing to a subsequence converge to g. Then $r(n)$ converge to a point in $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$. Now suppose that there is $\alpha \in \sigma$ so that $\alpha \notin \partial Y$. First α is a pinching curve of r. Then by Definition 2.7, α is a

component of the forward ending lamination of r. Second since Y is a large subsurface, $\alpha \subset Y$. But this contradicts our assumption that the restriction of ν^+ the forward ending lamination of r to Y is minimal filling. To see this, note that $\xi(Y) > 1$, so α does not fill Y. Therefore α would be a component of ν' the restriction of ν^+ to Y which contradicts the fact that ν' is minimal. The claim follows.

Now since the support of $\mathcal{L}$ is the lamination ν' in the subsurface Y, the above claim guarantees that no pinched curve at z (the curves in σ) intersects $\mathcal{L}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length at z. Then an argument similar to what we gave above where we assumed that z is in the thick part of the Teichmüller space implies that $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g. □

Proposition 6.6. *Let $r_{\nu^\pm}$ be a ray with prescribed itinerary with narrow end invariant (ν^-, ν^+) and bounded annular coefficients. Any measured lamination supported on a sublamination of ν^+ has bounded length along $r_{\nu^\pm}$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.5 in [BMM10] we consider the ray $\bar{r}$ as follows: since (ν^-, ν^+) is a narrow pair ν^+ has a minimal component ν' that fills a large subsurface Y. Let $\Sigma_{\nu'}$ be the simplex of the projective classes of measures supported on ν' in $\mathcal{PML}(Y)$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathcal{ML}(Y)$ be a representative of the projective class determined by a point in the interior of the top-dimensional face of $\Sigma_{\nu'}$. Then $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ is a linear combination of all ergodic measures supported on ν' with positive coefficients. Let $\gamma_n \in \mathcal{C}_0(Y)$ be a sequence of simple closed curves so that the projective classes $[\gamma_n]$ converge to $[\bar{\mathcal{L}}]$. Let c_n be a hyperbolic surface pinched at $\gamma_n \cup \partial Y$. Let r_n be a parametrization of $[x, c_n]$ by arclength. Let $\bar{r}$ be a limit of the geodesic segments r_n after possibly passing to a subsequence in the visual sphere of the Teichmüller space at x. Then by Lemma 2.11 $\bar{r}$ is an infinite ray and $\bar{\mathcal{L}}$ has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. This implies that any ergodic measure supported on ν' has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. Any measure supported on ν' is a linear combination of ergodic measures of ν' with non-negative coefficients. So we may conclude that any measure supported on ν' has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. Moreover by Lemma 2.11 every $\alpha \in \partial Y$ has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. Any sublamination of ν^+ is a union of ν' and some of the curves in ∂Y. Therefore, any measure supported on a sublamination of ν^+ has bounded length along $\bar{r}$.

We proceed to show that $r_{\nu^\pm}$ and $\bar{r}$ are strongly asymptotic rays. Denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. If r is not strongly asymptotic to $\bar{r}$, then by Theorem 6.5 there is a bi-infinite WP geodesic g strongly asymptotic to r in the forward time and asymptotic to $\bar{r}$ in the backward time. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be any ending measured lamination of r. Then by Lemma 2.9, $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along r. Moreover, $\mathcal{L}$ is supported on a sublamination of the forward ending lamination of r. By Lemma 2.12 the forward lamination of r contains ν', and therefore is a sublamination of ν^+. Then as we saw in the previous paragraph $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. Then by the second assertion of Theorem 6.5, $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along g. But this contradicts the convexity of

length-functions along WP geodesics (Theorem 2.6). Therefore r and $\bar{r}$ are strongly asymptotic. Now since both r and $\bar{r}$ start at x the convexity of the distance function between two geodesics in a CAT(0) space implies that $r = \bar{r}$.

As we saw in the first paragraph of the proof any measured lamination supported on a sublamination of ν^+ has bounded length along $\bar{r}$. By the second paragraph $r_{\nu^\pm} = \bar{r}$, thus any measured lamination supported on a sublamination of ν^+ has bounded length along r, as was desired. □

Here we rephrase Theorem 1.1 and prove it.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (ν^-, ν^+) be a narrow pair with bounded annular coefficients. Any WP geodesic ray r' with forward ending lamination ν^+ is strongly asymptotic to $r_{\nu^\pm}$.*

Proof. Denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. The lamination ν^+ has a minimal component ν' that fills a large subsurface Y. We show that any other infinite ray r' with forward ending lamination containing ν' is strongly asymptotic to r. Suppose not, then by Theorem 6.5 there is a bi-infinite geodesic g strongly asymptotic to r in the forward time and asymptotic to r' in the backward time. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ending measured lamination of r'. Then by Lemma 2.9 the length of $\mathcal{L}$ is bounded along r'. Moreover $\mathcal{L}$ is supported on a sublamination of the forward ending lamination of r' which is ν^+. Then Proposition 6.6 implies that $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along r as well. Then by the second assertion of Theorem 6.5, $\mathcal{L}$ has bounded length along the bi-infinite geodesic g. But this contradicts convexity of the $\mathcal{L}-$length-function along g (Theorem 2.6). Thus we conclude that r and r' are strongly asymptotic. □

As an application of Theorem 1.1 we provide a symbolic condition in terms of subsurface coefficients for divergence of WP geodesic rays in the moduli space. A geodesic ray is divergent if eventually leaves any compact subset of the moduli space. Recall that a pair (ν^-, ν^+) is $A-$narrow if $d_Z(\nu^-, \nu^+) > A$ implies that Z is a large subsurface.

Theorem 6.7. (Divergence condition) *Given $A, R, R' > 0$. Let (ν^-, ν^+) be an $A-$narrow pair on a Riemann surface S with $R'-$bounded annular coefficients and suppose that $d_S(\nu^-, \nu^+) \leq R$. Then a WP geodesic ray in $\mathcal{M}(S)$ with end invariant (ν^-, ν^+) is divergent.*

Proof. Let $r_{\nu^\pm}$ be the infinite ray with prescribed itinerary. For simplicity we denote $r_{\nu^\pm}$ by r. By the narrow condition the restriction of ν^+ to a large subsurface Y is minimal and fills Y. Moreover the condition $d_S(\nu^-, \nu^+) \leq R$ guarantees that Y is a proper subsurface of S. We proceed to show that given $\epsilon > 0$ there is a time $T > 0$ such that $\ell_\alpha(r(T)) \leq \epsilon$ for every $\alpha \in \partial Y$. Let $\rho : [0, \infty] \to P(S)$ be a hierarchy path between ν^- and ν^+. There is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any Z a component domain of ρ such that $J_Z \subseteq [N, \infty]$ we have $\partial Y \subseteq \partial Z$ (see [MM00, §5]).

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and set $d = 1$. It follows from Lemma 3.6 that there are $L' > 0$ and $\bar{w} > 0$ with the property that for any subinterval $[m', n'] \subset [0, \infty]$ with $n' - m' > L'$ there is Z a component domain of ρ and time $T > 0$ so that $\ell_\alpha(r(T)) \leq \epsilon$ for all $\alpha \in \partial Z$. Furthermore, as we saw above if $m' > N$ then $\partial Y \subseteq \partial Z$. Thus for any $\alpha \in \partial Y$, $\ell_\alpha(\hat{r}(T)) \leq \epsilon$. For each $\alpha \in \partial Y$, the function $\ell_\alpha(r(t)) : \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ is a convex function, moreover by Lemma 2.11 ℓ_α is bounded, thus it is a decreasing function. Therefore,

$$\ell_\alpha(r(t)) \leq \epsilon$$

for all $t \in [T, \infty)$. Now choosing ϵ arbitrary small, we may conclude that $\hat{r}$ the projection of the geodesic ray r to $\mathcal{M}(S)$ is a divergent WP geodesic ray.

Now by Theorem 1.1 any geodesic ray r' with the forward end invariant ν^+ is strongly asymptotic to r. As we saw above $\hat{r}$ is divergent in $\mathcal{M}(S)$, which implies that $\hat{r'}$ the projection of r' to $\mathcal{M}(S)$ is divergent as well. □

In [Mod15, §7.2] on any surface S with $\xi(S) > 1$, we construct pairs (ν^-, ν^+) where ν^- is a marking and ν^+ is a minimal filling lamination with the following properties:

- There is a list of large subsurfaces $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ so that for each i, $Z_i = Z_{i-1} \cap Z_{i+1}$, and $d_{Z_i}(\nu^-, \nu^+) \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$.
- The rest of subsurface coefficients, including the annular ones, are uniformly bounded above.

Furthermore, in §8 of [Mod15] we proved that there is a WP geodesic ray $r_{\nu^\pm}$ with end invariant (ν^-, ν^+) as above and prescribed itinerary so that its projection to the moduli space $\hat{r}_{\nu^\pm}$ is divergent. Here we prove that any WP geodesic with end invariant (ν^-, ν^+) is divergent in the moduli space.

Theorem 6.8. *Any WP geodesic ray with end invariant constructed in* [Mod15, §7.2] *is divergent in* $\mathcal{M}(S)$.

Proof. Since the only subsurfaces with big subsurface coefficient are large subsurfaces these pairs of partial markings or laminations are narrow. Moreover the pairs have bounded annular coefficients. Then by Theorem 1.1 any other geodesic ray r' with forward ending lamination ν^+ is strongly asymptotic to $r_{\nu^\pm}$. Moreover $\hat{r}_{\nu_\pm}$ is divergent in $\mathcal{M}(S)$. Thus $\hat{r'}$ is divergent. □

References

[BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[BMM10] Jeffrey Brock, Howard Masur, and Yair Minsky, *Asymptotics of Weil-Petersson geodesics. I. Ending laminations, recurrence, and flows*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **19** (2010), no. 5, 1229–1257.

[BMM11] ———, *Asymptotics of Weil-Petersson geodesics II: bounded geometry and unbounded entropy*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 4, 820–850.

[BO69] R. L. Bishop and B. O'Neill, *Manifolds of negative curvature*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **145** (1969), 1–49.

[Bro] Jeffrey Brock, *Personal communication.*

[Bro03] Jeffrey F. Brock, *The Weil-Petersson metric and volumes of 3-dimensional hyperbolic convex cores*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 3, 495–535.

[Bus10] Peter Buser, *Geometry and spectra of compact Riemann surfaces*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2010, Reprint of the 1992 edition.

[CE08] Jeff Cheeger and David G. Ebin, *Comparison theorems in Riemannian geometry*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2008, Revised reprint of the 1975 original.

[Cha06] Isaac Chavel, *Riemannian geometry*, second ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 98, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, A modern introduction.

[Ebe72] Patrick Eberlein, *Geodesic flows on negatively curved manifolds. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **95** (1972), 492–510.

[Foo84] Robert L. Foote, *Regularity of the distance function*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **92** (1984), no. 1, 153–155.

[Kla] Erica Klarreich, *The boundary at infinity of the curve complex*, Preprint, 1999.

[Min96] Yair N. Minsky, *Quasi-projections in Teichmüller space*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **473** (1996), 121–136.

[MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity*, Invent. Math. **138** (1999), no. 1, 103–149.

[MM00] H. A. Masur and Y. N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 4, 902–974.

[Mod15] Babak Modami, *Prescribing the behavior of Weil–Petersson geodesics in the moduli space of Riemann surfaces*, J. Topol. Anal. **7** (2015), no. 4, 543–676.

[PH92] R. C. Penner and J. L. Harer, *Combinatorics of train tracks*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 125, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992.

[Wol03] Scott A. Wolpert, *Geometry of the Weil-Petersson completion of Teichmüller space*, Surveys in differential geometry, Vol. VIII (Boston, MA, 2002), Surv. Differ. Geom., VIII, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003, pp. 357–393.

[Wol08] ———, *Behavior of geodesic-length functions on Teichmüller space*, J. Differential Geom. **79** (2008), no. 2, 277–334.

[Wol09] ———, *Extension of the Weil-Petersson connection*, Duke Math. J. **146** (2009), no. 2, 281–303.

[Wol10] ———, *Families of Riemann surfaces and Weil-Petersson geometry*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 113, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2010.

[Wol11] ———, *Understanding Weil-Petersson curvature*, Geometry and analysis. No. 1, Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM), vol. 17, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2011, pp. 495–515.

[Wol12] ———, *Geodesic-length functions and the Weil-Petersson curvature tensor*, J. Differential Geom. **91** (2012), no. 2, 321–359.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1409 W Green ST, Urbana, IL 61801

E-mail address: bmodami@illinois.edu